DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 538 | 24 | RC 004 588

AUTHOR	McKinley, Francis; And Others
TITLE	Who Should Control Indian Education? A History, Three Case Studies, Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, Berkeley, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-2931
PUB DATE	Feb 70
CONTRACT	OEC-4-7-062931-3064
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1 Garden Circle, Hote Claremont, Berkeley, California 94705 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.80
DESCRIPTORS	*Administration, *American Indians, Attitudes, Civil Rights, Community Problems, Curriculum, Disadvantaged Environment, *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), *Education, *Feasibility Studies, Improvement, Management, Pilot Projects, Socioeconomic Status, Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Conducted in 1967 by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development at the request of the National Indian Youth Council, this 1-year study was made on American Indians at the following sites; Loneman, South Dakota; Ponca City, Oklahoma; Crow Agency, Montana; Fort Berthold, North Dakota; Nondalton, Alaska; South Nek Nek, Alaska; Mescalero Apache Reservation, New Mexico; Papago Indian Reservation, Arizona; Seattle, Washington; and Indian boarding schools. The report describes the state of education available to American Indian children, presents 3 case studies, and offers a set of recommendations for improvement. Collection of base-line data included obtaining information on school administration, curriculum and teaching methods, student achievement, attitudes of teachers and administrators, and unique characteristics of the schools attended by the Indian children. Conclusions were that education provided for Indian children is a failure and has not succeeded in preparing them to be productive citizens in the larger society. In addition to the study activities, 3 pilot projects were developed at various sites: (1) educational materials libraries in Head Start schools, (2) a tutoring program for junior high students, and (3) a nonprofit organization for community development. (EL)

who should control Indian Education?

$1.

RC004588
ED042538
RC004588
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This report was produced by the FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT with funds provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The Laboratory is a non-profit public organization supported in part by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of either the Carnegie Corporation or the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by either organization should be inferred.

The Laboratory was established through a Joint Powers Agreement in February 1966. Signatories as of June 1969 include:

The Regents of the University of California
The California State Board of Education
The Trustees of the California State Colleges
The County Superintendent of Schools of the County of Monterey
The Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
The Regents of the University of Nevada
The Nevada State Board of Education
The Board of Regents of the University of Utah
The Utah State Board of Education

ED042538

WHO SHOULD CONTROL INDIAN EDUCATION?

- A History
- Three Case Studies
- Recommendations

A Report Prepared by

Francis McKinley, Stephen Bayne, and Glen Nimnicht

February 1970

Produced by
FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1 Garden Circle, Hotel Claremont
Berkeley, California 94705

FRANCIS MCKINLEY received his bachelor's degree in political science at George Washington University, and his master's degree in educational psychology from the University of Utah. Mr. McKinley is a member of the Ute Indian Tribe and has served on the Ute Tribal Council from 1959-1965. Mr. McKinley has been responsible for developing a number of educational programs for the Ute Tribe as well as for Arizona State University where he was Director of Indian Education, and the University of Wisconsin where he was an Indian Affairs Specialist. Mr. McKinley has also served as consultant to a number of organizations including the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the National Congress of American Indians. Formerly a Senior Program Associate at the Far West Laboratory, he is presently Executive Director of the National Indian Training and Research Center in Tempe, Arizona.

STEPHEN BAYNE received his bachelor's degree from Harvard University and his master's degree in applied anthropology from Columbia University. Mr. Bayne was Director of the Harvard-Radcliffe American Indian Project in 1963-1964, and has worked as director, counselor, and teacher in Indian youth camps since 1963. Mr. Bayne has conducted research studies in Indian education on the Navajo, Papago, and Hopi Reservations. He is presently Project Assistant at the Far West Laboratory.

GLEN NIMNICHT received his bachelor's degree in political science and his master's degree in educational administration from the University of Wyoming. He received his doctorate in educational administration from Stanford University. While at Colorado State College, Dr. Nimnicht was Professor of Education, Director of the Experimental Program in Teacher Education, and Director of the New Nursery School. Dr. Nimnicht is the author of numerous publications, including "The Responsive Environment Nursery School for Environmentally Deprived Children," and is presently Director of the program Education Beginning at Age Three at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

THE EDUCATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN 3

"Indian Education"--Does It Exist?. 3
The American Indian in the United States--Historical Perspective 5
The American Indian Child 10
The School and the Community. 19

CASE STUDY I--WHITE EAGLE COMMUNITY. 25

CASE STUDY II--LONEMAN DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL. 31

Pine Ridge Indian Reservation 31
Development of the Community-Controlled School. 33
Observations from the Case Study. 40

CASE STUDY III--STEWART BOARDING SCHOOL. 43

PROBLEMS OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS EDUCATION 47

RECOMMENDATIONS. 51

BIBLIOGRAPHY 55

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the following people to the completion of the research and documentation involved in this report.

Mrs. Adele Rosenzweig and Mrs. Sue Perry, for editing the final manuscript
Mr. Don Adcock, Mrs. Della Warrior, Mrs. Fran Thom, and Mr. Robert Dumont for performing the field work and writing preliminary analyses
Mr. Glenn Myles for the cover design from an original painting by Stella Loretto
Miss Jeanne Scheer for typing the final copy
Mrs. Sue Perry for proofreading the manuscript

Finally, and most importantly, we wish to thank the Indian people, teachers, and administrators who were kind enough to provide us with information on the state of American Indian education today.

Francis McKinley
Stephen Bayne
Glen Nimnicht

INTRODUCTION

In October 1967, the National Indian Youth Council contracted with the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development to study the education of Indian children at the following ten sites: Loneman, South Dakota; Ponca City, Oklahoma; Crow Agency, Montana; Fort Berthold, North Dakota; Nondalton, Alaska; South Nek Nek, Alaska; Mescalero Apache Reservation, New Mexico; Papago Indian Reservation, Arizona; Seattle, Washington; and Indian boarding schools. The study, financed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, was undertaken during the period from October 1967 through October 1969. The following report of the field work describes the state of education available to American Indian children during that period and offers a set of recommendations for initial steps to be taken to improve Indian education.

The reader should note that the study is not a rigidly controlled, statistically valid survey. Questionnaires and structured interviews were used with non-Indian teachers and administrators who accept such tools as part of their everyday professional lives. However, as Indians tend to resent these appurtenances of a "study" and do not care to be treated as "informants," we collected information from them by means of a large number of conversations with no attempt on our part to structure formal interviews. This report, then, is presented as a record of the state of Indian education as we observed it in a number of places using methods of investigation, both systematic and impressionistic, appropriate to the circumstances.

The Indian Education Study concentrated on two major kinds of activities. These were:

1. Collection of base-line data from the ten project sites. Data included information on school administration, curriculum and teaching methods, student achievement, attitudes of teachers and administrators, and the unique characteristics of the various kinds of schools attended by the Indian children. We were unable to collect systematic data about the attitudes of parents toward education and their reactions to proposed innovations, primarily because formal information-collecting devices appeared inappropriate for use with the Indian population.

2. Development of pilot projects which could be analyzed in terms of the likelihood that a given community could eventually assume responsibility for the education of its children. We developed educational materials libraries ("toy libraries") in Head Start schools at two of the sites (Crow Agency and Pine Ridge). A toy library is a parent-involving technique in which educational toys selected by teachers and aides are checked out by parents for use in teaching their children at home. At the time this report was prepared, the libraries had been in operation for only six months and data about their effectiveness were not available. A second pilot project, a tutoring program for junior high school students, was developed through our field consultants at the White Eagle School in Ponca City, Oklahoma. We also assisted in a third project, the development of a non-profit organization for community development at Ponca City.

Detailed case studies of three of the ten sites--Ponca City, Oklahoma; Loneman, South Dakota; and the Stewart Boarding School in Carson City, Nevada--are included in this report.

Although our study was limited in scope, we believe that a more comprehensive study would support our conclusion that the education provided for Indian

children is a failure when measured by any reasonable set of criteria. The educational system has not succeeded in providing the majority of Indian children with the minimum level of competence necessary to prepare them to be productive citizens in the larger society. In addition, very little attempt has been made to perpetuate the values and culture unique to the Indian people or to provide Indians with a sense of pride in their own heritage and the confidence that they can effectively control their own future development. Schools attended by Indians, both public schools and those supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, greatly need to improve their instructional programs and methods and their teacher training programs and, particularly, to increase teacher understanding of the unique problems of the Indian students and their parents. However, increases in money, time, and effort spent on Indian education can only relieve some of the more important symptoms of the larger, underlying problem which is the general relationship between Indians and white people and, specifically, the paternalistic relationship between the white power structure and the Indian communities.

THE EDUCATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

"Indian Education"--Does It Exist?

What quality of formal or public education is available to American Indian children today? As we shall demonstrate in this study, the vast majority of American Indian children now receive an education which is inferior to that available to most white children. Why? The education available to Indian children is inferior because "Indian education" as a body of pedagogical principles or techniques does not exist. Rather, we may define Indian education as the imposition of white American educational institutions upon American Indian communities. There is no tradition of formal education which is "Indian." There are certainly ancient traditions of informal education in American Indian cultures, but these traditions have never had any relationship to the schools now operating in American Indian communities; Indian people themselves have always referred to the schools as "white man's schools."

However, there are two basic reasons why "Indian education" should exist as a subject apart from education in general. First, the history of education for Indians has been separate from that of education for other Americans. Until quite recently most Indians attended school in a system of boarding and day schools operated by the Federal Government through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Thus, Indian education has been almost synonymous with BIA education, separated both physically and philosophically from the educational concerns for non-Indians. Secondly, by any measure available, American Indian children are not as successful as non-Indian children in adapting to the classroom culture of the American school and in meeting those criteria of educational achievement set by the school. Indian children score lower on most standardized tests, read and write English less proficiently, drop out of school earlier and in larger numbers, attend school less frequently, and behave less satisfactorily in the classroom than non-Indian children. Because of these two reasons, special concern must be given to "Indian education" as a unique subject and to improving the quality of that education.

Since the 1930's, when the Meriam Report first brought the inadequacies, archaisms, and cruelties of the existing BIA educational institutions to public notice, some concern has been shown for the education of Indian children. Books, monographs, and articles have been written on language problems, analysis of standardized test performances, psychological differences between Indian and white children, the effects of acculturation, and conflicts between the culture of the child's home and that of the school. The results of this research comprise a body of data which includes a plethora of varied and often conflicting suggestions by educators, psychologists, and anthropologists as to how the deplorable state of Indian education can be improved and theories about what Indian education should ideally be like.

This research, however, has focused on a very small number of reservations. Indian studies have often been limited to the Navajo and to the Sioux on the Pine Ridge Reservation where 64 field studies are currently in progress. The reasons for this lack of balance are primarily demographic and historical. The Navajo tribe is by far the largest in the United States and it has kept its culture intact in far more obvious ways than most other tribal groups. Thus, it offers a large and attractive field for anthropological research. The Sioux on Pine Ridge have had a romantic and tragic history which has caught the imagination of researchers and the American public alike, to whom the names Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse are synonymous with "Indians." A profusion of base-line data on these tribes is available, but for the Ponca, the Crow, and the Mescalero Apaches--tribes with current educational problems of critical importance--

the literature is sparse. Thus, the amount of material included on the Navajo and the Pine Ridge Sioux reflects the interests of researchers rather than the primacy of the educational and acculturation problems of the tribal groups.

In addition, very few researchers have bothered to ask Indians themselves what they feel Indian education should be like. This omission is especially serious in light of this country's growing interest in community control of education by communities of the urban and rural poor, and by communities of ethnic and racial minority groups. To what extent do Indian communities actually control the formal education of their children? Although Indians occasionally get elected to a public school board of education and often serve in some advisory capacity for the BIA schools (such as membership on advisory school boards) or on the tribal education committees, they do not usually control or even affect the decision-making processes involved in school administration.

Asking to what extent Indians control the education of their children is only a part of the larger question: To what extent do Indians generally control their own affairs? The answer to the latter question is that American Indians have little or no voice in their own affairs. Nearly everyone who has been concerned with the subject has pointed out that the BIA has maintained paternalistic control over the American Indians. The Bureau, in turn, is subject to the manipulations of powerful and influential politicans often representing white entrepreneurs who covet the Indians' land and resources. Many of our nation's legislators state that the solution to the Indians' problems is one of integration or assimilation, when their real objective is to abolish the Indians' legal rights, to dissolve their special relationships with the Federal Government, to terminate unfulfilled obligations, to disperse the Indians, and then to seize their lands and abundant resources. One can confirm that this description is accurate by examining the long list of broken treaties; the Indian laws (many of whose provisions have never been implemented, but more often violated); specific acts of Congress such as the General Allotment Act, House Concurrent Resolution 108 (which succeeded in terminating several tribes), and Public Law 871 of the 63rd Congress (which transferred law and order jurisdiction from some tribes to the states); and the cases of the Kinsua Dam, Pyramid Lake, Taos Pueblo's sacred mountain, and Garrison Dam.

Examination of the budget requests of the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the past few years, the process of budget cutting by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, and their final appropriations demonstrates that the programs to preserve the Indian reservations and Indian trust status receive inadequate or no funding while those programs that take the Indian away from his home and reservation, such as Employment Assistance for relocation in urban areas, receive ample appropriations. (80) The negative attitude of many Congressmen toward perpetuating the present trustee relationship to American Indians and toward sponsoring or supporting legislation to develop Indian communities is partly responsible for the Indians' dependent and impoverished state. Typically, Indians have no firm social or economic base to use for entry into the mainstream of American life as self-respecting, confident, and responsible citizens.

It is thus against a background of dependency and impoverishment that we examine the efforts to educate Indians and to prepare them to live useful and rewarding lives as American citizens. In doing so, we will try to answer the following questions: What quality of formal education is available to American Indian children? How can American Indian communities be encouraged to take significant responsibility for the functioning of schools when the opinions of Indians on formal education are difficult to discover, and perhaps, except for

vast generalities, nonexistent? Are the opinions of Indians about the schools limited to deep antipathy, passive acceptance, or considerations of the relationship between the school and practical job skills? Or, if Indians have no particular interest in the schools, what are the reasons for their lack of interest, and how can the situation be remedied so that Indian parents have as much influence and control over the schools as their white counterparts? Our study will first review the historical background of Indian education and then the data provided by current literature and by our own research. Finally, we will present what we feel to be the most promising ways of improving the quality of Indian education and of stimulating interest in and responsibility for education by the American Indian community.

The American Indian in the United States--Historical Perspective

Approximately 700,000 American Indians now live in the continental United States, and 30,000 Eskimos and Aleuts live in the State of Alaska. In 1967, 440,000 of these Indian and Alaskan natives received services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, which holds 38.9 million acres of land in 390 reservations, colonies, rancherias, and communities in trust for tribal groups of native Americans. Most of these Indians live in poverty. Indian families on reservations have a median income of only $1500; unemployment rates often exceed 50%; and 90% of reservation housing is substandard by Federal Government standards.

By any criteria, then, Indians are poor; but their material poverty should not be equated with cultural poverty, for the cultural heritage of the American Indian is rich. The material poverty of Indians results from two factors--first, living in generally impoverished areas and, secondly, the particular relationship of Indian society to white society. (82) An understanding of the relationship between these two societies is crucial to understanding the problems faced by American Indians today.

Before the advent of the reservation system, Indian societies, though differing tremendously in culture, were similar in that all were based on face-to-face, kinship-oriented communities. In communities of this sort, relationships between people over time and in everyday activities are of primary importance, to the extent that the community is defined as a group of kin. "A Sioux is a kinsman, by definition. Kin relations regulate Sioux society and permeate all tasks and activities. In aboriginal times, institutional forms were built upon the kinship system so that even in institutional contexts kinsmen dealt as kinsmen with other kinsmen." (74) Albert Warhaftig describes this "tribal" society as "an enormous family . . . united by actual kinship, by co-residence and constant person-to-person interaction, by common understanding of their uniqueness as a single people, and by a firm desire to survive, unmolested insofar as possible, as a people." (82)

Inaugurated in the 1860's, the reservation system was a systematic effort to remake these societies into white American communities, with white American subsistence activities, institutions, and social structures. Gordon MacGregor described the development of this process on the Sioux Reservation at Pine Ridge. In accord with a treaty signed in 1868, the Sioux were settled on a huge reservation. This reservation was later broken up into five separate agencies, one of which was Pine Ridge. Following the military defeat of the Sioux after the Sioux War of 1875-76 and during the time when the last buffalo, the very source of life for the Plains Indians, were disappearing, the civilian superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency immediately began a program to prepare the bands under

his charge for the settled ways of white farmers. His first step was to suppress the Sun Dance which was the most important religious event on the Plains. The

> breakup of family life and the family groups of tepees, the undermining of the authority of the chiefs, and the placement of children in boarding school followed in quick succession. . . . The agent had two particular powers by which he kept the Indians under his control: the ration of beef and a police company of fifty Indians. Thus, when the Indians seemed to cling too tenaciously to camping by band groups, holding council by themselves, or being uncooperative, he withheld rations or utilized the police to force a charge . . . . The undermining of native controls and native leadership was followed later by official regulations which forbade native dances, ceremonies, and customs which were believed to impede the acceptance of white life. These regulations were in force until 1934. (50)

The philosophy behind these actions was succinctly stated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1879.

> Indians are essentially conservative, and cling tenaciously to old customs and hate all changes: therefore the government should force them to scatter out on farms, break up their tribal organization, dances, ceremonies, and tom-foolery; take from them their hundreds of useless ponies, which afford them the means of indulging in their wandering, nomadic habits, and give them cattle in exchange, and compel them to labor or to accept the alternative of starvation. (74)

The Pine Ridge Agency promoted livestock enterprises, supervised the allotment, inheritance, and leasing of land, issued rations and relief, managed the individual Indian's financial facilities, took over the administration of internal political affairs, dispensed justice, and assumed jurisdiction of law and order problems." (16) Social, political, and economic structures were put into the hands of a bureaucracy from a radically different type of culture, leaving the Indian communities no way to function. Thus, the aboriginal social structure and institutions decayed because they were no longer dealing with the important affairs of community life. Today,

> nearly all their former institutions on the local level have disappeared. The small Sioux community is hardly even a community in the strict sense of the word. It is a kin group without the aboriginal institutions which once related them to their environment, and no substitute institutions have developed in their place. New institutions have been pre-empted by outsiders. The old Chief's Council is non-functional. The warriors' societies have long since disappeared and the local police force is seen as a foreign and illegitimate coercive force. Thus, few (practically no) means of social control are left to the local Sioux community. There are no local school boards--the schools are run by the federal government. Their churches are run by an outside religious hierarchy. Economic institutions are virtually nonexistent. (50)

Yet the everyday kinship network still remains within most Indian communities. Murray Wax wrote in "Enemies of the People" that the reservation is

composed of small local communities which are predominantly composed of kin. Each of these small communities maintains an internal organization and economy of extraordinary efficiency." (84) In northeastern Oklahoma, Cherokee and white societies

> are clearly coterritorial, and white and Indian social communities overlap spatially (there is no reservation). This does not mean that whites and Indians are participants in common communities. In those intimate matters through which a human community defines itself (friendships and informal visiting, consoling the sick and helping the disaster-stricken, the informal maintenance of proper behavior, religious and ceremonial activities, pondering the future) Indian communities and white communities are totally separate. Each Indian settlement is in many ways like one large family. (26)

Even in the metropolitan centers of Los Angeles, Oakland, and Chicago, the Indian population retains its identity through a social network clearly separated from the surrounding white city culture. In attempting to move Indian people from the Los Angeles slums, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was hindered by the Indian families' refusal to move for fear of losing contact with friends and relatives in the slum area. (52) The San Francisco Bay Indian community, primarily the branch located in Oakland, is described as having an observable "self-conscious Indian-ness." (1) The Oakland Indians choose to associate almost exclusively with each other and do not seek contact with whites. Relatives and tribesmen see each other frequently and are free in extending mutual help. Households are flexible and, no matter how small the space, needy tribesmen are taken in and given food and money. They consider themselves "in a unique Indian social niche which is alien to the community social hierarchy." (1)

Thus, in the metropolis as on the reservation, a basis does exist for American Indian communities to develop responsibility for their own affairs. A foundation is present in the still functioning Indian social networks for an end to the colonial relationship between Indians and white America. These social and community networks seem to be viable enough to re-assume control of some of the institutions which have been externally controlled since the 1860's. Current research indicates that formal education of American Indian children is one institution particularly likely to benefit from local or community control. We shall now review the past history of Indian education, its current status, and the relationship between the schools and some Indian communities.

The History of Federal Indian Education

Until very recently, most children on Indian reservations received their formal education in federal boarding and day schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In 1910, the Bureau had written: "The task is to provide the needed development and supply the lacks caused by a faulty environment, so that the Indian child may be brought up to that standard of cleanliness, order, regularity and discipline which the public school presupposes in its white children. The task is changing a way of living." (79) Thus, it is not surprising that Bureau education in the boarding schools was characterized by harsh discipline, military drill, use of cast-off army clothing, self-support from farm and herd, rural vocational training unrelated to employment on the reservations or in the cities, and purposeful separation of the children from home and family.

> Children were virtually kidnapped to force them into government schools. Life in the school was under military discipline, and rules were enforced by corporal punishment. Children were forbidden to speak their own language. Those who persisted in clinging to their old ways and those who ran away and were recaptured were thrown into jail. Parents who objected were also jailed. Where possible, children were kept in school year after year to avoid the influence of their families. (50)

In 1928, responding to public furor, the Senate initiated a series of investigations which led to the publication of the Meriam Report of 1929. The basic philosophy toward Indian education had changed. The Meriam Report stated that "education must provide for promotion of health, advancement of productive efficiency, the acquisition of reasonable ability in the utilization of income and property, guarding against exploitation, and the maintenance of reasonably high standards of community life." (79) The report advocated specific reforms, such as the prohibition of jails and severe punishment in the boarding schools, as well as the idea that realistic, employment-oriented courses would be more important to the Indian child than academic courses, since it was expected that most Indians would continue to work on the primarily rural reservations, and could best become "Americans" by "absorption into the industrial and agricultural life of the nation."

The reforms initiated by the Meriam Report were continued and greatly extended from 1933 to 1945 by John Collier's administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau de-emphasized the boarding schools and closed them wherever possible, replacing them by day schools near to the children's homes. The Indian children could thus receive a "white education" while still participating in their own culture. The educational aims of the schools reflected Collier's tremendous respect for the ancient cultures of the Indian people: "There will be no interference with Indian religious life"; "The cultural history of Indians is to be considered in all respects equal to that of any non-Indian group"; and "It is desirable that Indians be bilingual—fluent and literate in the English language, and fluent in their vital, beautiful, and efficient native languages. The Indian arts are to be prized, nourished, and honored." (79)

Unfortunately, Collier's most important educational views did not prevail after his administration. His program met persistent congressional criticism which culminated in a 1944 report demanding "that the emphasis in Indian schools be upon developing better 'Indian Americans' rather than the existing emphasis upon perpetuating the Indian as a special status individual and that the emphasis on day schools give way to a program promoting attendance at off-reservation boarding schools." (79)

The next major change in Indian education occurred after World War II, when federal funds were first provided for the construction and operation of public schools in reservation areas. As the federal day schools closed, Indian children began to attend nearby public schools. Since the 1950's the Bureau of Indian Affairs has continued this policy and maintained that

> the education of Indian children is primarily a responsibility of the states, but that under special circumstances (e.g., isolation, language difficulties, or family disorganization), the BIA will conduct its own educational programs. To do this, it is now operating what is in all probability the largest boarding school system in the

world, with facilities for 40,000 students in operation or under construction, and facilities for an additional 20,000 day students. Nevertheless, the BIA's stated goal has always been a public school education for every Indian child. (57)

An Overview of Indian Education Today

Today, 32.6% of American Indian children attend Bureau schools; however, the variation from reservation to reservation is tremendous, with a range extending from 0% to 100%. Whether the reservation school is BIA or public, it seems to have distinct characteristics which make it an "Indian" school. In fact, the differences between public and BIA schools seem to be so insignificant that the current heated debate over the preferability of public to BIA schools seems almost academic. The following description of such schools is based upon our study of public and BIA schools on six reservations.

The schools are located in remote and poor areas. In some of the districts, students ride buses for three hours every day. Some of the schools provide recreational services for the community, such as movies, intramural athletics, and scouting programs; others also provide bathing facilities for the students. Because of the poverty of the areas in which they are located, most of the schools must depend on outside resources, both state and federal, for financial support. As a result, administrators continually complain of inadequate funds and, in some cases, financial difficulties have forced administrators to think almost exclusively in terms of physical facilities. At one school we visited, the entire budget was allocated to plant operation, salaries, school lunches, and transportation, officially leaving no money for textbooks, experimental programs, or new classroom equipment. At another school, the principal equally emphasized the school's four services--instruction, transportation, nutrition, and sanitation--and saw no significant change in the school's policy toward increasing community control or improving instruction until the physical plant has been renovated. At a third school, the superintendent actually spent school time building new classrooms because money was not available to hire labor. It is interesting to note, however, that most of the schools are in fairly good physical condition and that the facilities themselves do not seem to justify the degree to which administrators are preoccupied with physical problems.

The lack of private transportation at the reservation sites poses an additional problem. Most Indian children must leave their homes and wait for a school bus by the road. Because of substandard home facilities and because Indian families are not oriented toward rigid schedules, it is often difficult for the children to meet the bus every morning at the same time. Either their inability or their unwillingness to meet an inflexible bus schedule is probably one factor in the poor attendance record of many Indian children.

The dropout rate is unusually high at all of the schools. Using one all-Indian non-reservation public school as an example, only 4 children graduated in 1967 out of an initial class of 16, 4 were still in school but behind their grade, and the other 8 children had dropped out. Only 3 children graduated in 1968 out of an initial class of 15. These dropout rates of 50% and 80% are by no means unusual. Most surveys have estimated the national dropout rate for Indian school children in all types of schools to be 60%.

Teacher turnover is also very high at most of the schools; at schools in remote areas, the turnover rate may rise as high as 70% annually, and, in one case, has been 90% for the past two years. The teachers at the schools have a number of characteristics in common. They are either quite young or quite old,

with very few in the age range between 30 and 45. As a result, a large number of the teachers are either inexperienced, or else teaching according to precepts and methods learned at a time when educational philosophy was radically different from today. Most of the teachers received their education in small teachers colleges in the state in which the school is located, even though the BIA schools theoretically draw teachers from anywhere in the United States. The majority have only a bachelor's degree or less. Among the teachers in our sample, the percentage of graduate degrees rose above the usual 15% only at the large off-reservation boarding school at Anadarko, Oklahoma.

Although the instructional programs in the Indian schools will be discussed in detail later in this report, their chief characteristic can be easily summarized here—curriculum and textbooks are without exception not adapted in any way to American Indian students. Neither the BIA school nor the public schools serving the Indians diverge from the usual fare of readers and classroom materials geared to white children.

The American Indian Child

The American Indian child differs from his white counterpart in many ways other than in skin color. Cultural differences are more complex, more difficult to understand, and far more difficult to deal with than physical differences. Yet educators and administrators on reservations must have an understanding of these cultural differences and their origins in order to develop appropriate educational programs.

Since World War II, a substantial amount of research has been done on the patterns of child development and personality in Indian children, with quite consistent results. American Indian children, especially those in isolated, rural areas, are brought up very differently from white children, and thus develop a significantly different type of personality. Child-rearing in American Indian cultures, when compared with white American practices, seems extremely permissive; physical punishments are not used. In 1946, MacGregor wrote of the Sioux: "The methods of teaching small children proper behavior are based on encouraging the child to do what is desired by kindness and patience and by example rather than by a long series of 'don'ts'. Warnings and shaming the child are started early by criticizing him for not doing what is proper and approved." (50) Laura Thompson writes that "Hopi children are treated with great indulgence when very young. They are nursed whenever they cry, and allowed an extended period for toilet training." (76) In 1967, Mildred Dickeman noted that "Cherokees often say they are 'strict' with their children, which is true in their own terms. But the white who takes this statement at face value in the semantics of his own behavior will grievously misunderstand. Cherokees rarely engage in physical discipline. Their means of disciplining are the soft voice, withdrawal, and staring. They engage in more explanation and less dogmatic assertion." (26)

In their classic study American Indian and White Children, Havighurst and Neugarten, documented some of the results of this type of upbringing on the personality of Southwest Indian children. "Southwest Indian children exhibit far less conscience or superego function than do Midwest white children--rather they have a self-consciousness or sense of shame of public disapproval." (36) For the Southwest Indian child, "morality lies in interpersonal relations and in the group good. The group, rather than the individual, is categorically valued. Goodness and badness for the child lie primarily in how he relates himself to other people." (36)

Many authors have attempted to formulate a general description of the personality of the American Indian child, and have produced various lists of traits, each list differing from the next. However, certain traits always seem to reappear: orientation toward the present rather than the future; fear and distrust of unknown situations and people; great generosity; a strong feeling of individual autonomy (not allowing coercion or intrusion into personal matters); and a feeling for harmony and cooperation rather than for competition. It must be remembered, however, that these are generalities, and that personalities differ widely among various Indian cultures as well as among individual human beings. We need only compare Rosalie Wax's description of the Sioux ("Sioux boys are reared to be physically reckless and impetuous. If they are not capable of an occasional act of derring-do, their folks may accept them as 'quiet' or 'bashful', but they are not the ideal type of son, brother, or sweetheart." [88]) with Laura Thompson's description of Hopi children ("cooperative, peaceful, and unagressive . . . unusually balanced with fine adjustment between the expression and control of psychic forces" [76]) to appreciate the necessity for understanding the children in any American Indian group, and for <u>not</u> treating them as merely culturally-deprived whites or as representatives of some generalized "Indian" personality type.

In addition, an Indian child today is not the product solely of his own culture. The culture of white America impinges on his life more strongly now than ever before. After studying acculturation among Menomini Indians, George and Louise Spindler tried to generalize about the personality type emerging in rapidly changing American Indian cultures. Their research indicated that most traditional Indians possess a high degree of rational control over overt emotional expressions. However, as acculturation increases the tendency for responses based on ego needs, much of the emotional control of the group-oriented culture is lost, and erratic emotional responses appear frequently, particularly in the form of outbursts of undirected agression. (71) Boggs, on the other hand, found that the "introverted, passive personality" of the Ojibwa was exaggerated even more during acculturation. (12)

The stark fact of poverty on the reservations seems to affect the Indians' traditional lack of concern for material things. Havighurst found that Southwest Indian children were more concerned than their Midwestern white counterparts with "the securing of property, food, clothing, and other possessions as sources of pleasant emotion and the loss or damage of these things as sources of unpleasant emotions." (36) Elizabeth Hoyt collected essays from 255 Indian children about their future plans, and found that they mentioned the desire for a good job above anything else. (39) Hildegard Thompson's studies show that Indian adolescents are twice as concerned as adolescents elsewhere in the nation with learning what jobs are available and how to get them. (75) Several studies (e.g., 11, 8) show that Indian children are particularly and deeply disturbed by the conflict between their desire to find a good job and their desire to stay on the reservation, where jobs are scarce or sometimes nonexistent.

What happens when these children, raised in a different culture and exposed to the frustrations of poverty as well as to the bewilderment produced by rapid change, attend the white man's school?

The Indian Child in School--Test Results

The use of standardized tests to measure the intellectual potential and academic achievement of children has been questioned and criticized by professionals and laymen alike, who doubt that such tests really measure the broad categories of "intelligence," "mental maturity," or "academic aptitude." The

use of these same standardized tests with groups of children from ethnic minorities must be even more seriously questioned. Do the tests measure what they purport to measure? And are they valid measures when the children being tested have been raised in a culture different from that of the test designers? It seems that the only safe conclusion which can be drawn is that standardized tests measure the degree to which the intellectual apparatus of the minority (in this case, Indian) child is similar to that of the white child.

We have, then, one measure of intellectual acculturation. The testing data to date merely substantiate this point; they demonstrate that test results correlate with various other measures of acculturation. For example, in 1948, Peterson found that "median scores on arithmetic, reading, and language tests show that Indian children attending public schools with white children do better than the Indian children in the other schools." (60) Knute Lee's South Dakota study of scores on the California Achievement Test replicated this result, finding that Indian students from predominantly white schools scored slightly higher than Indians from predominantly Indian schools. (47) In 1953, Kenneth E. Anderson administered 12 achievement tests to several thousand Indian children and discovered that the more acculturated Indians (measured by degree of white blood and ability to speak English on entering school) scored higher than the less acculturated Indians, and that Indian pupils living off the reservation scored higher than those living on the reservation. (6) L. Madison Coombs administered the California Achievement Test to 24,000 Indian and white children in 1958 and found that white children scored significantly higher than Indian children in all types of schools. (24) David Lloyd gave the California Tests of Mental Maturity and the California Achievement Tests to Indian and non-Indian children in integrated public schools in Mesa, Arizona in 1961. His study indicated that "Indians were achieving at a somewhat lower level than non-Indians in all subjects and at all grade levels," but that Indians who had spent their entire educational life in the Mesa public schools tended to have a higher I.Q. than those resident for only a short time. (49) Finally, a 1965 study by Barbara Lindsay found that white children, matched in I.Q. with a group of Bannoc Indian children, did significantly better on the California Achievement Tests than the Bannoc children, and that mixed blood Indians scored higher than full blood Indians. (48)

The results of these testing programs are alarmingly consistent. Indians who are measured to be acculturated in some ways (for example, mixed blood, English language use, years in an integrated school, residence off the reservation) appear to be acculturated by yet another measure: higher scores than their less acculturated brothers on standardized achievement tests. Thus the tautology that "acculturated Indians are acculturated." The same results can also be interpreted to mean that Indian children do not meet certain arbitrary testing standards of white schools as well as white pupils do--when these standards are defined by white educational authorities without reference to the cultural differences of the children being tested.

In an attempt to make standardized tests more culture-free, and thus less biased toward white students or highly acculturated Indian students, some investigators have used non-verbal or performance tests to measure the intelligence of Indian children. In 1944, Havighurst administered the non-verbal Grace Arthur Performance Scale to 800 Indian children and to a control group of Midwestern white children. He found that "American Indian children from several different tribes do as well as white children on a performance test of intelligence" and that evidence on the relationship between test performance and acculturation was inconclusive. (38) Two years later, Havighurst administered the Goodenough Draw-A-Man Test to 325 Indian children and to a Midwestern white

control group. This time he found that Indian children did better than white children. The mean I.Q. scores ranged from 106.9 to 113.3 for various tribal groups, compared with 101.2 for the Midwestern control group. (37) Thus, results on non-verbal, and therefore less ethnocentric, standardized tests indicate that Indian children are at least as "intelligent" (if that is indeed what the tests measure) as white children from similar rural backgrounds.

Finally, mention should be made of Y. T. Witherspoon's 1962 study of Ute Indian children in public schools because its results contradict the optimistic picture of school achievement drawn by the results of non-verbal tests. Finding that Ute children's scores on standardized achievement tests were often "no higher than chance," Witherspoon developed an experimental battery of tests aimed at minimizing the particular problems Indian children seemed to have with standardized tests. Given to Indian and non-Indian students in a high school, junior high school, and three elementary schools, the new test battery results showed that "Indian children achieved at a lower level than their non-Indian peers" and that "the gap between Indian and non-Indian achievement becomes greater as the groups move through the public schools." (91) The latter result is confirmed by an earlier study by Ralph Branchard (14) and a later study by Stephen Bayne (9), both of which show a gradually widening gap in school performance, especially after the fourth grade. These tests, combined with the unusually high dropout rate on many reservations, strongly suggest that factors within the school situation as well as factors in the Indian child's cultural background may be significant in understanding why the Indian child does not meet the expectations of educators.

The Indian Child in School--The Classroom

A recent study of education on the Navajo Reservation identified some of the difficulties Navajo Indian children face in the classroom. Interviewing over 70 teachers on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona, Stephen Bayne consistently noted "a distinct turning point in the educational motivation of Navajo children which occurs around the third or fourth grade." (9) Teachers of beginners through third-graders said that their pupils were bright, receptive, and eager to learn; teachers were amazed at the rapidity with which the children who had spoken and heard only Navajo at home learned English. Beginning with the fourth grade, however, teachers described their students as apathetic, difficult to motivate, uninterested in the school and in learning, and occasionally openly hostile to the teacher and the school experience.

Searching for factors both at home and in school which could be a source of this lack of motivation, Bayne found the following to be important:

1. Navajo grandparents are often antagonistic to the schools. They have feared that now, as in the past, education would make their children less suited for Navajo life.

2. Parents are usually unfamiliar with the school and its work. Many Navajo parents have had only a few years of schooling and have not found that experience relevant to their occupations as farmers and herders.

3. Educated Navajos are not fully trusted by their own people. In the past, education has meant forced acculturation, and graduates of government boarding schools went back to their people ignorant and disdainful of traditional Navajo culture, unable and unwilling to live as their parents did. The educated misfits were ridiculed and

ostracized for "trying to be white men." This attitude is still prevalent, although most Navajos increasingly respect the skills of these educated people.

4. At home, and in the classroom, social control via peer-group shaming is the traditional method of discipline in most American Indian cultures. As a result, the classroom atmosphere can be quite frightening for the Navajo child, who will hesitate before responding in the class because he knows that an overbright response, a "stupid" answer, or an answer given in incorrect English will make him the butt of his peers' ridicule.

5. Navajo children are brought up to disapprove of those people who consciously try to "get ahead" of others to achieve status. Robert Roessel mentions the classic case of a Navajo girl who received a perfect score on a spelling test and was lavishly praised by the teacher. The teacher was greatly disturbed when, for weeks after, the same girl was seemingly unable to spell a single word correctly. Chastised by her peers for having been singled out and praised, she chose acceptance in the terms of her culture and peer group, rather than achievement in the terms of the white classroom. (66)

Thus, a number of unique cross-cultural conflicts in values increase the complexity of the problems faced by the teacher on the reservation. Miles Zintz emphasized the differences in values held by teachers of Pueblo Indian children and values of those children. The teachers valued "mastery, future time orientation, competition and success, individuality, and agression" while their pupils valued "harmony, present time orientation, maintenance of the status quo, anonymity and submissiveness." (94)

Wax, Leighton, Kluckhohn, Bayne, and Ray all mention a second conflict between the school culture and the Indian child. Wax notes that "within Sioux culture all individuals, including children, are free to set their own schedule of activities. Thus the Indian child, when he enters school, is accustomed to an environment in which interference with plans is minimal. To such a child, formal schooling is excessively and disturbingly regimented." (88) Dorothy Leighton and Clyde Kluckhohn write that "[Indian] children and adults do not belong to two separate worlds. The same set of standards prevails in most things for all ages, from the child to the very old people." (44) This is, of course, not the case in the school, where the child is ordered about, required to conform to a rigid schedule, and permitted to make few decisions on his own. Teachers in the Bayne study said that this rigid control is especially resented by boys, and that it may be the reason why many youths drop out of school. Charles Ray found the same situation in Alaska, where secondary-school dropouts proved to be far more resentful of discipline than those Eskimo and Indian children who remained in school. (62)

Our own field data indicate that Indian children prefer the style of learning characteristic of their native culture. Generally, the learner initiates an extended period of observation and attempts performance only when he feels fairly certain of his ability. Premature, bungling attempts are met with teasing, and successful attempts with quiet acceptance. The characteristics of learning in the American classroom (i.e., initiation by the teacher, premature public practice, public praise, and public correction) are all antithetical to this aboriginal style. These characteristics are also distasteful to modern American Indian children who prefer self-directed and self-initiated projects, ungraded curricula, and learning activities which can be completed with minimal

interaction between student and teacher, except when the interaction involves friendly help on an individual basis.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the present "lecture-discussion-group drill" style of the usual reservation classroom is ineffective with Indian children. Teachers note that their Indian children prefer doing work-sheets to classroom activity, that reading laboratories and programmed courses at several of the schools are very successful, and that, at one site, students showed greater progress in the Head Start classroom where learning takes place through independent activities than in the first-grade classroom. In the Head Start classroom, children eagerly spoke with their teachers both in English and their native language. In contrast, in the standard first-grade classroom, the children hardly spoke with the teacher at all, were inactive, and seemed uninterested.

A variation on this theme of preference for individual study and independent activity occurs in the Southwest, where both Papago and Mescalero Apache children prefer studying in small groups. However, even these children prefer group work which is oriented toward independent projects and which necessitates only a minimal amount of contact with the teacher.

Another theme which emerged from our data is that Indian students are most enthusiastic about learning when it is an integral part of creative activities which let the student express himself in diverse ways. Creative writing, drawing, model making, and drama are all popular when integrated into classroom projects. In general, teachers who have experienced success with creative activities seem to be professionally competent and highly interested in their students. Instructional methods which emphasize creative activities appear to be more effective than those which are based on programmed learning. It may be, in fact, that the teachers who stress programmed learning are not equipped for the far more difficult solution of devising creative, holistic, project-oriented curricula for Indian children. However, both approaches seem to work and to yield far more satisfactory results than lectures and oral classroom drill. Many schools, and primarily those in urban areas, have incorporated both programmed learning and creative projects into the curriculum. However, both approaches are rare in the rural schools in which the majority of Indian children are educated.

Murray and Rosalie Wax described what often happens in the Sioux classroom when no attempt is made to adapt the traditional American classroom to Indian children.

> Issuing from small local communities of kith and kin, and sharing a common set of values and understandings, as well as language that was unknown to most teachers, the Sioux children could and did create within the formal structure of the educational institution a highly cohesive society of their own. . . . We observed that in some classrooms the children are learning virtually nothing of a scholastic nature. By the fifth or sixth grade they had become adept at disrupting and inhibiting the process of instruction. They feigned stupidity, refused to listen, sharpened pencils loudly when asked to read, and wrote on the board in letters so small no one could read them. When asked to read aloud they held their books before their faces and mumbled a few incomprehensible words. The teacher was not aware that other pupils were teasing the readers, by signs and whispers in their native language. (86)

Mildred Dickeman has recently analyzed a similar situation among the Oklahoma Cherokees. She found that the culture of the classroom in rural northeastern Oklahoma strongly conflicted with the Cherokee values of emotional restraint, high respect for the autonomy and privacy of others, disapproval of anger and physical violence, and accordance of adult trust and integrity to children. According to Dickeman,

> White teachers expect of their students that they eagerly perform publicly, individually, without assistance or emotional support from their peers. They are expected, indeed, to compete and to invidiously compare, to judge and be judged not on the basis of their total personalities . . . but on the basis of their ability to perform allotted tasks in allotted periods of time. Students are expected not only to respond on command. . . but to express joy and enthusiasm at their tasks, also on command. Should they fail to do these things, they may be subjected to loud public verbal abuse, derogating not only their classroom performances, but their intelligence, appearance, socioeconomic status and future prospects. As if this (to a Cherokee) incredible shame were not enough, the Oklahoma school system allows the use of the paddle--the final physical violation of the Cherokee child. (26)

The classroom differs in style from the Sioux classroom, yet it places the child in a similarly intolerable environment in which he ceases to respond.

> The least cooperative students pursue a consistent policy of nonresponse, even regarding materials on which they are prepared. . . . The majority of the students employ mumbling or quiet recitation in answering questions concerning school work, but refuse to answer that large class of rhetorical and non-academic questions with which the dispairing teacher fills the silence of the classroom. Most Cherokees abandon the fruitless and painful experience soon after they are legally able to do so. Total withdrawal from the school system is the final act in defense of Cherokee feelings of integrity. (26)

The classroom thus becomes a place where a single adult representing white American cultural values attempts to impose those values on a group of children to whom those values are intolerable.

> Since the participants are one adult and many children, and since the latter are imbued with a cultural standard of nonviolence and passive resistance, open confrontations do not occur. Instead. . . a wall of silence that is impenetrable to the outsider while sheltering a rich emotional communion among themselves. (29)

The Indian Child and His Teacher

The conflict is exacerbated by the types of people who are usually found teaching in Indian schools. Dickeman indicates that "many of the teachers derive from the local area and have been raised all their lives among Cherokee. But the acquaintance which they have so acquired is similar to that which many whites of the Deep South have about Negroes: it is a ritual of caste, and not a comprehension of humanity." (27) In New Mexico public schools, Zintz found that "Teachers are not sensitive to socio-cultural differences of Indian, Spanish-American, and Anglo children. While teachers are aware of some obvious

differences in language, customs, and experience backgrounds, they do not interpret underlying value conflicts." (94)

Perhaps one of the most serious problems is that teachers tend to react to the children in terms of their own values which are often those of the white middle class. Our field data include an interesting example of the way in which ethnocentric attitudes can affect a teacher's interpretation of a community. We interviewed two teachers at neighborhood schools on one of the reservation sites, with the following results:

Q. What do you consider to be the primary purpose of your school?

A. Our basic purpose is to teach the children the values of cleanliness, morality, hard work, and discipline.

B. We can only try to prepare the children for productive and happy lives.

Q. Does your school stress life on the reservation, or off the reservation?

A. The successful Indians are off the reservation. The failures come back, but they're happy here on the reservation because they lead a lazy, undisciplined life. (I don't see how they can be happy living the way they do!) They live off welfare, and are ridiculed and ostracized by the Indians when they try to work at steady jobs.

B. We stress life off the reservation primarily because there are no jobs here. If jobs could be developed on the reservation, it would of course be preferable. The students really want to return to their home village. They won't even take a job in another section of the reservation if they can help it. The young people are quite frightened of off-reservation life, and simply lack the knowledge to adequately cope with it. The Indians aren't lazy, they're just unwilling to leave their home village. When opportunities arise at the village area, they are anxious to work, and are conscientious workers.

Q. How do the parents of your students feel about education and your school?

A. The parents hold the children back, and teach them not to respect themselves. It is the parents, not white people who tell the children "You're just an Indian—you can't do anything." Parents are hostile to the school, and to education in general, and don't say a thing when they come to meetings. The Indians don't see the purpose of trying to get ahead in life because whatever money they make or possessions they acquire have to be shared with everyone--so why should they try?

B. Of course parents contribute to keeping the children at the village--they would like their children to be home the same as white parents, if not more. Nevertheless, the parents feel positively about education and the school, and participate actively in community meetings.

Q. What future do you envision for your present elementary school students?

A. Most of them will just come back here and be welfare cases. Education doesn't seem to help at all.

B. They are the generation which is really going to change things and develop real opportunities for themselves on the reservation.

The contrasts evident in these interviews are even more striking in light of the backgrounds of the two teachers--backgrounds which are essentially the same. Both came from the Midwest, had their primary teaching experience in Midwestern public schools, and both taught previously on another reservation. Teacher A has been at her present position for two years, and Teacher B has been at hers for five years. Both are dedicated teachers. The main difference between the two is that Teacher A has never questioned her own values and she is intent on imposing them upon her pupils of whom she is critical. Teacher B, however, tries to understand the children and their community according to their values and does not attempt to judge them by hers. Thus, Teacher A is basically pessimistic about the children, because they will never live up to her values. Teacher B, by contrast, is basically optimistic about her pupils because she sees them working toward goals which will be satisfying for them. Both teachers are angry and frustrated with the apathetic BIA bureaucracy. Teacher B is deeply involved with community development activities and participates actively in the life of the Indian community, however, while Teacher A merely complains that the parents never come to her.

Unfortunately, the vast majority of teachers we interviewed were more like Teacher A than Teacher B. Of the 76 teachers interviewed by Bayne on Arizona reservations, "only nine had any special preparation or training for the cross-cultural problems involved in teaching American Indian children. Over one-third of the teachers not only lacked knowledge and experience with other cultures, but were uninterested in their jobs as teachers of American Indian children." (9) As the valedictorian of a large off-reservation boarding school informed us, "most of these teachers are here to teach and then get home as soon as possible."

A minority of the teachers we interviewed (our rough estimate is 6%) were not only unprepared for cross-cultural teaching, but were actually prejudiced against Indian children. Among these, we might mention a 68-year-old boarding school teacher who described his pupils as "scrapings from the bottom of the barrel," and told us that "these kids don't have much between the ears." Another boarding school teacher asked an Indian member of our project if he knew two "lousy, rotten kids" who were members of his tribe. This type of teacher is not unique to the boarding schools. A member of our project staff interviewed the mother of a promising young Indian athlete in a public junior high school. The youth had asked his football coach why he was constantly being benched and was told, "If you want to play football, why don't you go to the Indian school to play!"

Our survey found that every school had some teachers who were interested in their students and concerned with their problems. However, in nearly every case, even these intelligent and dynamic teachers were condescending and patronizing toward their students. Most of these teachers seemed to have considered, but rejected, the possibility of cultural differences as an explanation for the behavior of their students. For them, the students were no different from other children except that they lived in a culture of poverty; the students merely lacked diverse experiences, responsible adult models, and economic opportunity. In short, these teachers appeared to believe that greater doses of compensatory education would properly assimilate Indian students into the general culture.

If these teachers did not openly suggest that their students leave the reservation, they did suggest that the reservation become more like the rest of American society. None of them suggested that acceptable values might already exist within the Indian community.

Finally, we must at least mention the vicious circle of low expectations and low standards which was prevalent in most of the schools studied by this project. The circle begins when a teacher starts teaching at an Indian school, having had previous experience only with white children in white schools--schools in which the values and practices were congruent with those of the child's home and community. The teacher expects to function basically the same way in the Indian school as in the white school but immediately confronts the tremendous classroom problems resulting from lack of congruence between the culture of the child's home and the culture of the classroom. Specifically, the teacher must deal with children for whom English is a second language, for whom certain types of competitive behavior are repugnant, for whom schedules and rigid classroom discipline are frustrating, and who are confused and uncertain of their identities in the world of white America. Faced with the immense difficulty of dealing with these children, and untrained in the subtle and sophisticated means by which a handful of teachers orient the classroom to the cultural norms and expectations of the children, the teacher reacts by drastically lowering her standards of classroom achievement. Standards are lowered, and lowered again until the children meet some set criteria of success. Teaching according to these new standards, the teacher experiences her first feelings of achievement, and is thus reinforced in maintaining low standards and in believing that the Indian children are incapable of meeting any higher standards. The vicious circle is then complete--the teacher teaches according to low standards, the children achieve drastically lowered educational goals, and the teacher's use of low standards is reinforced--and low student achievement is assured.

The School and the Community

The most significant obstacle to developing a system of education appropriate for American Indians seems to be the substantial differences which exist between the cultural values and attitudes of the Indian child and those of the traditional white American school. The Indian child, however, cannot be separated from the Indian community, nor can the white school be separated from the white society of which it is a part. We are convinced that the relationship between whites and Indians--a relationship that is basically paternalistic--is the heart of the problem. Over a number of years, this relationship has demeaned the Indians, destroyed their self-respect and self-confidence, developed and encouraged apathy and a sense of alienation from the educational process, and deprived Indians, as a community, of the opportunity to develop the ability and experience to control their own affairs. As a result, Indians today distrust the white man and his system but see themselves as unable to develop a system of their own. White administrators and educators see the Indian as disinterested and unwilling to participate in the education of his children.

Since a program of formal education for Indians was first initiated by the Federal Government, there has been almost no attempt by the schools to establish communication with the parents and relatives of Indian children, much less any attempt to understand their attitudes or to adapt curricula to their culture. Murray and Rosalie Wax found that on the Pine Ridge Reservation,

> the parents rarely entered the school and never saw what went on in the classrooms; whereas the teachers on their part never visited the parents or attended any of the local Indian social events. . . . Indian elders were not permitted to use the school for gatherings or entertainment, lest they dirty the floors and destroy government property. Around each consolidated school was a compound in which the teachers lived and kept to themselves. . . . Sioux elders, faced with the power of the education establishment, simply withdrew. In this tactic they were encouraged by the education administrators, who found the absence of the parents convenient and proper, since the parents would have no background for understanding the operations of the school and "could only have interferred." (84)

Bayne found the same situation to be prevalent on the Navajo and Papago reservations in Arizona.

Interviews with Indian parents at all sites confirmed that they have little or no contact with the schools educating their children. They will visit the school only when their children have been accused of some wrongdoing or misbehavior. When asked about major school problems, Indian parents will mention disagreements among students either at the school playground or on the school bus. Lax discipline and breakdown of parental authority are cited by parents as the main factors contributing toward failure in school. Many parents feel that the easy familiarity between boys and girls encouraged by relaxed moral standards among Americans has influenced the Indian younger generation to go beyond the sanctions of their own society, and has resulted in a breakdown of morality and in promiscuous behavior. Even though Indian parents believe that everyone should have a good education, they tend to rate education below concerns for better housing, sanitation, adequate water supply, income, and transportation. They view the goal of education as obtaining "a good job."

At each of the sites we visited, only limited interaction took place between the Indian parents and the teachers. On one reservation, the houses of Indian families are physically separated from the school and the houses of BIA families by a deep ditch. Roads lead into the community on either side of the ditch, and no roads cross it. Few parents have ever visited the school and none of the teachers has ever been in an Indian home. Several of the teachers interviewed at other sites (and particularly the public school teachers) complained that they were never invited into Indian homes and that, during their rare home visits, they were met in the front yard. When asked about this complaint, some of the parents said that this was true in a great many cases and primarily because the Indians were ashamed of their homes. Also, the Indian parents did not want to provide any material for teacher gossip. The Tribal Chairman on another reservation told us that "the only time the schools contact me is when the kids are in real trouble and the school wants me to get the probation offices in contact with the parents."

Yet administrators at the schools never articulated the schools' problems in terms of cultural differences or lack of communication between school and community. They spoke instead of attendance and language problems and displayed a basic lack of understanding of and respect for people for whom time is not measured by the minutes of an inflexible schedule, and for whom the ability to speak their native language is <u>not</u> a "deficiency." (Few of the teachers, of course, can speak more than a few words of the language of their students.)

Attitudes of school administrators and teachers are uncertain and ambiguous toward more Indian involvement and assumption of more decision-making powers in school affairs. It is generally agreed that Indians should assume more

active roles in the educative process; however, educators are skeptical about how much Indians can actually contribute to the school. If Indian culture encourages non-competition, does not stress strong time orientation, emphasizes sharing, restrains agressiveness, and places the group needs above those of the individual, then the culture is at cross purposes with schools' goals and objectives that stress competitiveness, agression, strong time and structural orientation, rigid work habits, and individual success and achievement in a mobile society. In other words, educators tend to view the school positively as a middle-class institution, dispensing middle-class values and attitudes, and to view the Indian children as products of a deprived, non-middle-class environment, who must somehow overcome their handicaps.

Indian life and environment are still commonly viewed as somehow immoral, uncivilized, primitive, and a great handicap to anyone who wants to find his niche in the American society. A teacher at the Phoenix Indian school said in an interview, "These children are intelligent and capable of learning. We work hard all year and get them to a point where we think we are teaching them proper attitudes, good habits, and a desire to know; then they go home for the summer and forget in three months everything that we have taught them." Another teacher at the same school said, "It is our responsibility to bring these children back to normal--to civilize them." An Indian teacher in one of the Oklahoma BIA boarding schools said that the only way to assure good education for Indian children was to take them away from their reservation environment. The Director of the Chilocco Indian school said that the trouble with the students in his school were the "cronies" back home and that if the students could be separated from these "cronies" they could become motivated to achieve in school. He stated that these "cronies" were beyond redemption.

The principal at the Bent-Mescalero school informed our interviewer that the greatest handicap of the Mescalero Apache students was their inability to understand and communicate in English. The principal wanted to assume control of the Head Start school operated by the Mescalero Apache Tribe because he felt that English was not being stressed enough and that the teachers (mostly Indian) were untrained and unqualified.

If the educators view Indian life with distaste and misgivings, it follows that they would be very reluctant to see Indians taking control of the schools. Many of the educators' attitudes may seem justified when one views the life of many Indians today, rife with factionalism, squalor, drunkenness, broken homes, lack of pride, and loss of self-esteem. However, in part, this very situation is engendered by the demeaning and denigrating attitudes held not only by educators but by others who come in contact with American Indians.

Another factor impeding communication between the school and the Indian community is that well meaning local administrators and field workers are often insensitive to the desires of the community in which they are working. In "Enemies of the People," the Waxes described the process by which idealistic but untrained Vista workers and social service professionals inaugurated and firmly controlled a Head Start program on a reservation, completely ignoring the wishes of the reservation communities.

> We visited many Head Start projects for Indian cultures, and in most of them we found that the programs had been funded, planned, staffed, and put into operation with virtually no involvement of the children's parents. At several of the schools the parents had subsequently approached the directors and teachers with complaints and suggestions concerning the operations of the schools. But in every case, the professional staff regarded this parental interest with distress . . .

> as if it reflected a failure either in planning or procedure. Parental involvement was defined as the parents complying with the suggestions of the teachers. (84)

Our own observations of Head Start projects on the Hopi and Fort Berthold Reservations do not, however, confirm the Waxes' experience. Both programs were marked by real parental pride and involvement. Although the Bureau of Indian Affairs is officially on record as encouraging and supporting control of the schools by local school boards composed of Indians from the community, one still encounters the old attitudes: a BIA Area Director for Education told us that "We cannot allow a board of illiterates to run the schools"; a second BIA official told a group of Indian leaders, in our presence, "The best thing you can do about Indian education is to leave the decisions to us. The Bureau schools have been good for you--look where you are now."

Experiments in Community Control

As previously indicated, American Indian parents and communities today have little control over their affairs and the education of their children. Yet viable American Indian communities do exist, although they have been deprived of their normal functions by a reservation system which has controlled most aspects of community life. These communities have remained alive for over 30,000 years, including over 400 years of intensive internal colonialism, and it would appear that they will continue to exist for a long time to come. During the last decade, national experience has shown that healthy, functioning communities are an essential part of any effective program to eradicate poverty from our country. Should not American Indian communities as well be allowed to redevelop responsibility for their own welfare and progress? More "benevolent colonialism" of the form described above by the Waxes has not been an effective solution, and it will never supplant control by the community itself.

If a community is to control its own destiny, it must have control over the education of its children. Indeed, it can be argued that the only solution to the educational problems of the American Indian is for education to be placed back within the culture and community in which the children are raised. Indian children will not become less prepared for life in the larger American society by attending Indian schools--Indian parents are too strongly concerned with the economic and social welfare of their children (if not with their formal education) to allow that to happen. Each Indian community will not approach the problem in the same manner, but neither would all non-Indian communities across the country. Rough Rock, an isolated Navajo community, has already initiated one program in community control of education. While the Rough Rock approach would not be suitable for all Indian communities, it does appear to be highly successful and it does indicate the potential effectiveness of control by Indian communities.

By way of introduction, it should be noted that the operation of a Western formal education system by American Indian communities is not a completely new phenomenon. Throughout most of the nineteenth century, the Cherokees and the Choctaws operated their own school systems, at first in their native lands in Georgia and Alabama, and later in the Oklahoma "Indian Country" after their removal to Oklahoma in 1832. School was taught in English and their native languages. Both native lnaguages were oral as well as written. The Choctaw school system included a central board of education with elected district trustees, who appointed local trustees. The trustees were in charge of selecting teachers (both white and Choctaw), examining teachers, visiting the schools, and encouraging school attendance within the community. The system included boarding

schools, community day schools, Sunday school literacy classes, and college scholarships. Angie Debo writes that "as a result of its excellent public-school system the Choctaw Nation had a much higher proportion of educated people than any of the neighboring states; the number of college graduates one encounters in any contemporary record is surprising, and the quality of written English used by the Choctaws both in their official and private correspondence is distinctly superior to that of the white people surrounding them." (25)

The most widely publicized of the new ventures in community control is the school at Rough Rock, an isolated community in the north-central part of the Navajo Reservation. After the failure in 1965 of an attempt to create an experimental school at Lukachukai by superimposing an OEO team of community-development professionals on the BIA teaching staff, both OEO and the BIA contributed money toward the funding of a community-oriented experimental school at Rough Rock. Over $600,000 was turned over to a private, non-profit organization composed of Navajos from the Tribal Council, and a new $3 1/2 million school was given to the project by the BIA.

The people of Rough Rock elected one woman and four men to the school board. "All were middle-aged Navajo and only two had ever had as much as a day of formal education." (65) Complete control of the school was immediately given to this board. The school board, the principal, and his staff were jointly responsible for the operation of the school. Daily meetings between the school board and the staff determined the nature of the curriculum and gave a decidedly "Navajo cast" to the school. Today, Navajo children are involved in an integrated bilingual educational program which begins in kindergarten.

> Navajo motifs are mixed freely with other classroom decorations. The library has a Navajo corner. Recordings of Navajo music and rituals are played during the school day. In the evening, old men, the historians and medicine men of the tribe, come to the dormitories and tell Navajo folk tales and legends. (65)

Since its initiation, the Rough Rock community has continued to be strongly involved in the operation and use of the school. School facilities are open to anyone in the community who wants to use them. The school sponsors fairs, movies, and sports events; parents are always welcome in the school and at school board meetings, and are hired (eight every month on a rotating basis) to mend clothes, tell stories, and perform other tasks in the dormitories. Rough Rock staff members visit the homes of their pupils at least twice a year. An extensive adult-education program is operated by the school, with adults choosing the type of instruction to be offered.

Critics have pointed out, however, that the Rough Rock School cannot be considered a model for other schools because the community did not initiate the school nor could the school exist without the extraordinary financial support of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Yet, the people of the community call the school <u>din'e biol'ta</u> (the Navajo's school), and in its daily operation, it <u>is</u> their school. Although Rough Rock's unique financial status does limit its transferability as a model for other schools, Rough Rock does demonstrate that control of a school by an Indian community is feasible and can be effective. Whether Rough Rock will become an organizational pattern for other Indian community schools is yet to be seen.

CASE STUDY I--WHITE EAGLE COMMUNITY

The site of our first case study was White Eagle, a Ponca Indian community located five miles from Ponca City, Oklahoma. This site was chosen primarily because Clyde Warrior, the former president of the National Indian Youth Council, which sponsored the study, was a member of the Ponca Tribe.

Indians now living in White Eagle are descendents of Poncas who were forcibly brought to Oklahoma from Nebraska in 1877 by the U. S. Army. Over one-third of the Poncas died during the first year and the rest were early prey to outlaw whisky runners. Although Ponca City is an affluent community which is headquarters of the Continental Oil Company, the Poncas are one of the most poverty stricken groups in Oklahoma. Continental Oil employs few Indians because they are "undependable." A field report by Della Warrior indicated that unemployment rates run between 65% and 75%, that the Poncas have inadequate housing and suffer from poor sanitation and health, that many of them have chronic diet deficiencies, and that there is a high rate of alcoholism and crime due to the use of alcohol.

The Ponca situation today is both complex and contradictory. The Oklahoma Poncas have the reputation among anthropologists and fellow Indians of being more self-consciously and proudly Indian and far less acculturated than other Oklahoma Indians. In his definitive study of the Poncas, James H. Howard wrote: "Indian ways are still highly valued by many, and participation in the Peyote rites and Indian powwows continues to be important . . . they furnish singers and dancers for the celebrations of many surrounding tribes." However, in Oklahoma, Poncas are known generally as apathetic, irresponsible, belligerent, and self-deprecating. These particular attributes were revealed most strongly in our interviews with young Poncas.

Questionnaires and interviews of Ponca students at the White Eagle School and at Ponca City High School indicated that Poncas were more conscious of their membership in a low caste racial minority than they were of being Ponca. Ponca students showed little evidence of a positive Indian identity. They said, "I'm not very proud to be an Indian in Ponca City because there is a lot of drinking and fighting and now you can hardly get a job in Ponca City." One girl wrote that the only thing special about being Ponca was that "everyone says they're lazy and like to fight." Similarly, young Poncas showed little feeling for their tribal heritage; their apathy was often accompanied by disparaging statements about their heritage. When asked what the "Indian way" meant to them, they answered, "Beliefs in some old myths," and "Things that older people have done and they would have their children go on doing and don't realize the world is changing." From their point of view, the only positive aspect of being Indian was that Indians are almost white. Their essays stressed this repeatedly: for example, "An Indian . . . is a light color of a person"; "an Indian is a person who is light complected"; "an Indian can be a Caucasian, a light-colored person."

Our case study began late in 1967 when the late Clyde Warrior, former president of the National Indian Youth Council, and his wife initiated some community-developed activities in White Eagle. Mr. Warrior, college educated and known nationally as a "radical" Indian organizer, was particularly interested in education-oriented programs of community development similar to programs he had observed during a 1963 visit to the Ute Reservation. The major problems to be resolved were whether the Warriors would be accepted by the community, and whether they would be able to stimulate a notoriously apathetic community to an awareness of its problems and to subsequent action. Generally, educated Indians

are spurned by their home communities as "white men." At White Eagle, the more successful Poncas usually drift into the white middle-class world of Ponca City rather than face the enmity of their own community. Not only were the Warriors hampered by being "educated Indians," but Mrs. Warrior was not a Ponca, but an Otoe--a member of a tribe located 40 miles from White Eagle.

The Warriors and the project staff at the Far West Laboratory decided that the best approach to follow at White Eagle would be to gather base-line data while developing pilot projects of community action. Both Mr. and Mrs. Warrior felt that the Poncas needed some kind of successful experience to demonstrate to themselves and to the surrounding white world that they could end their normal ingroup bickering and factionalism, and bring about change through concerted action.

The first test of the Warrior's effectiveness as community developers came in April 1968 when an election was scheduled to select a new member of the school board for the White Eagle School. This small public elementary school (enrollment 67), exclusively attended by Ponca children, was described by one local "middle-class" Indian as a "blight on the community." Attendance was sporadic, achievement was far below state norms, and the dropout rate by sixth grade was 87%. Little communication took place between school personnel and the Indian community, and many Indians reported that teachers held a very low opinion of their children. Efforts were periodically made by Ponca City whites and middle-class-oriented Indians to close the school and send the children to integrated schools in Ponca City. The majority of the Indian community, however, preferred to keep the school open, to improve it, and to convert it into a community-controlled school. The Warriors felt that the election of an Indian to the school board each time a position opened (none had been on the board for 20 years) would be a first step in this direction.

The Warriors immediately began to talk to friends and neighbors, and to hold meetings to discuss registration, voting, and the function of school boards. They discovered that no Indian had served on the board for 20 years because local officials had convinced the Poncas that registration procedures were extremely complicated and would put them in jeopardy of having their land taxed. Secondly, many Indians were afraid that they would be evicted from their rented homes if they alienated the white community, as eviction had been threatened in the past.

The result of the Warrior's registration and voting drive was the withdrawal of the white candidate from an election he could not possibly have won, and the automatic election of the Indian candidate sponsored by the Warriors and the White Eagle community.

The enthusiasm and community solidarity stimulated by the school board election led to the formation of the White Eagle Community Development Association by members of the Indian community in May 1968. The non-profit association, composed of 50 members of the White Eagle Indian community, obtained funds and materials from foundations and civic groups, and formulated plans for a library, tutoring and remedial programs, counseling, guidance, and recreational programs, business cooperatives, and a series of radio programs.

Before describing the programs of the White Eagle Community Development Association, mention should be made of the effect upon the white community of the National Indian Youth Council's participation in the Poor People's Campaign of May 1968. As a result of Mr. Warrior's speech against white racism, which was reported in the national press, he was denounced as a Communist by Ponca

City whites and evicted from his home. Even after Mr. Warrior's death in June 1968, the Community Development Association encountered opposition from some local groups. However, a number of local groups actively supported the Association: the local Baptist and Methodist churches sponsored tutorial programs; the Coalition of American Indian Citizens and Oklahomans for Indian Opportunity arranged for major funding for the Association through the National Council of the Episcopal Church; a local lawyer donated legal services; and the local BIA social worker, the Ponca Tribal Council, and the Ponca City Chamber of Commerce all pledged the organization full support.

At the time this report was prepared, the Association's programs had included:

1. A Tutorial Program--Supported by funds from the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, the Association organized a summer tutorial program for sixth- and seventh-graders who were transferring from the White Eagle school to the junior high school in Ponca City. An 8-week program with courses in current events, English writing and grammar, mathematics and social studies, and discussions of Ponca culture and history was developed to bridge the educational gap between the Ponca students and their white classmates.

2. A Ponca Culture Course--Following the successful summer tutoring program, members of the Association approached the principal of the White Eagle school with a request that the curriculum include a course in Ponca history and culture to be taught by members of the Ponca community. The principal of the school agreed to the value of such a course, indicated that it would probably fit into the school schedule, and said that she would personally give it her attention.

   One month later, the principal informed members of the Association that they must contact the clerk of the school board and the county superintendent of schools about addition of the course. The principal added that she was optimistic and hoped the course would work out because she "wanted to help the Indian children in every possible way." The clerk of the school board was also supportive of the Ponca parents. The superintendent of schools, however, indicated that the teachers felt the schedule was already too crowded, and that the school board was totally opposed to the course. When the Association contacted the principal to discuss the superintendent's response, she said, "It sounds to me like somebody's passing the buck." She promised to verify the status of the course. A few days later, she notified the Association that the course had been approved and provided a class schedule.

   The Association thus proceeded to develop the course. Shortly afterward, an article about the course appeared in the Ponca City newspaper; the article elicited a prompt phone call from the superintendent who announced that addition of the course was out of the question. He maintained that not only were the teachers doing an excellent job of incorporating instruction in Ponca culture in the regular curriculum, but that addition of the course would deprive children of instruction in subjects that they "needed" (e.g., mathematics, English and science). He dismissed the possibility that the course could be valuable by the remark that the world was competitive and that "their [Ponca] culture was going to be lost anyway and they would be better off in the long run if they knew less of it." The superintendent added that many

people were opposed to a course which would "teach the children to hate white people" and that even some Indian parents were against it.

The White Eagle Community Development Association decided to confront the superintendent to discuss the matter with him; however, he would not agree to a meeting. As a result, ten Poncas converged upon the school to talk to the teachers. The principal immediately telephoned the superintendent who, although he refused to meet with the Poncas, dismissed school for the afternoon so the teachers could explain to the Poncas why the addition of the course was impossible. The Poncas were angered that the superintendent and teachers seemed to be able to dismiss school at their discretion, yet they would not allow the Poncas 1 1/2 hours a week to instruct their children in Ponca culture. The principal assumed the blame for mishandling the Ponca request, but feelings of alienation within the Ponca community were strengthened and reinforced.

In the end, the Association planned to prepare materials for the course to be submitted directly to the State Board of Education and proceeded with the classes outside of the school and with less than full participation by the Indian community. When the faculty of the Ponca City school learned that the Association had proceeded with their plans outside the school, the teachers communicated their disapproval but did not interfere with the Association's project.

3. A Radio Program--In January 1968, the White Eagle Community Development Association initiated a weekly series of 15-minute radio programs over the local station WBBZ. The purposes of these broadcasts, as defined by the Association were (a) to serve the cultural and educational needs of the Indian community; (b) to discuss the Indians' position in society and clarify the nature of their problems; and (c) to serve the Ponca City community by providing a forum for discussion between Indians and non-Indians.

4. Civil Rights Activities--During November 1968, the Association was successful in two related civil rights issues. For many years a cafe in Red Rock, located about 16 miles from Ponca City, had displayed a sign reading, "No beer served to Indians." An Association officer, accompanied by a social worker from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, visited the cafe proprietor and advised him that he was in violation of the state's anti-discrimination law. Within a week the offending sign was removed.

   In a similar situation, a certain bar in Ponca City had consistently refused to serve Indians. To test the case, a young member of the Association went to the bar, requested service, and was refused. When he protested, the bartender stated that a city ordinance prohibited bar service to Indians within the city limits. The Assocation investigated and found that no such ordinance existed.

5. Employment--Association members visited the Continential Oil Company in November 1968 to confer with company officials regarding more employment for Ponca Indians and the possibility that the company might establish a cooperative store and gas station at White Eagle. Mrs. Warrior reported that company officials were very interested, and that they requested a statement from the Association on how such enterprises

might contribute toward educational experiences for people of the White Eagle community.

6. A General Store--In December, the Association received a grant for general community development from the Episcopal Church to start a cooperative general store. At the time this report was prepared, the store was handling groceries exclusively, with hopes to sell a diversity of merchandise in the near future.

The White Eagle case obviously was not a "grassroots" movement. The Warriors, even though they were Indians from the area, must be considered as external change agents. Starting with a voter registration drive, the Warriors provided the basis for an active community organization with continually expanding functions and interests. However, the community, united for the first time in years did realize its collective power to influence its own affairs in civil rights, community relations, and employment.

Indeed, White Eagle was almost a classic case of community awakening. A jealousy-ridden, bickering, self-denigrating group without formal community functions (yet with the family-kin matrix which provided a base for growth) developed within one year into an aware community attempting to solve its problems through organization and systematic planning. This is not to say that all original problems were solved. After a year, leadership was still contested, and the organization tended to fall into inaction without important issues. Conflicts still arose both within the organization and between the organization and the civic and church groups financing and cooperating in its efforts. However, for the first time, a systematic and organized attempt was made by the White Eagle community to work on its own problems. The White Eagle Community Development Association dealt with a public school system that was unresponsive to Indian culture and community preferences, with racial discrimination, with unemployment, and with apathy and distrust within the community. The community attempted to solve these problems by many means--by electing community representatives to the school board, by community-directed teaching of Ponca history, culture and values, by legally contesting discriminatory practices, and by organized programs of economic cooperation and employment assistance. The most important outcome, however, was the pride and confidence in accomplishment which these efforts engendered in the White Eagle community--pride and confidence which are absolute prerequisites for the Poncas if they are to control their lives and their children's future.

CASE STUDY II--LONEMAN DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL

The second case study describes the complex difficulties of introducing community-directed education on an Indian reservation. This narrative does not record a success, but rather the failure of an Indian community to assume control of its school.

On August 8, 1968, the residents of the White Clay District on the Pine Ridge Sioux Indian Reservation held a referendum to decide whether the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Loneman Day School should be operated by Oyate Incorporated, a non-profit local Indian-sponsored organization. The proposal was rejected by a vote of 134 to 104. The defeat ended four years of planning for the Loneman Demonstration School Project by an all-Indian Advisory School Board and by Indian community leaders from the White Clay District.

First proposed in 1964, the demonstration school was a response to urgings by the Office of Economic Opportunity to initiate "grass roots" community action programs. At one time, the ambitious project had the support of a majority of the patrons of the Loneman Day School and the 1966 Oglala Sioux Tribal Council; however, the proposal was soon lost in a welter of confusion, misunderstanding, political conflicts, legal complications, and ambivalence and indecision on the part of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The proposed project stimulated personality clashes, ancient tribal rivalries, fears of violating peace treaties with the United States Government, and anxieties that the United States Congress would terminate its trust responsibilities over American Indians because they were brash enough to demand self-determination. The proposal became a major political campaign issue in the 1968 election and may have contributed to the defeat of the Chairman of the Tribal Council and some Council members who were its advocates.

The Pine Ridge Indian Reservation

Established on March 2, 1889, the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation is the second largest Indian reservation in the United States. Today, the reservation comprises approximately 2,786,578 acres or 4,353 square miles, an area twice the size of the State of Delaware. The reservation is situated in the southwestern area of the State of South Dakota and its southern boundary lines border on the Nebraska state line. Residing on this reservation are approximately 10,000 Oglala Sioux Indians, one of the largest of the Sioux Indian tribes. Over half the reservation population live in isolated areas, while the rest live in small rural settlements. The reservation is geographically isolated. The land is poor. Much of it was allotted to individual Indians who are long deceased, but whose heirs do not now use the land because of a complicated land tenure system created by federal trusteeship. Only about 11% of the land is used for agricultural purposes.

Three federal agencies serve the reservation: the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Division of Indian Health of the U. S. Public Health Service, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. In the past few years, other agencies of the Federal Government have provided additional services: the Office of Education, the Department of Labor (Manpower Training Program), and the Department of Commerce (Economic Development Program).

The reservation is divided into eight districts, primarily to determine representation on the Tribal Council which is the governing body of the tribe.

The Oglala Sioux Tribal Council

The Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe was organized on January 7, 1936, under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (45 Stat. 984 as amended). The governing body of the tribe, the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council, elects its chairman who is the presiding officer and exercises a number of administrative functions. The chairman is assisted by an Executive Committee consisting of four members. A unique feature of the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council's Executive Committee is that the superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the Pine Ridge Reservation is a member. The BIA explanation for his membership is that the Oglala Sioux Indians do not trust their Tribal Council and, ostensibly, the superintendent will protect their interests.

The Tribal Council appoints both permanent and ad hoc committees as well as an administrative staff. One committee appointed by the Council is the Reservation Education Planning Committee which advises the Tribal Council on educational matters. This committee is distinct from the committees which function at a lower level in the tribe's political hierarchy, namely, the community and district educational committees and the advisory school boards.

White Clay District

The White Clay District is situated on the western end of the Pine Ridge Reservation. During the past year, the U. S. Public Health Service conducted a base-line study of the Pine Ridge population, including a statistical description of the White Clay population. The data drawn from this USPHS study, which is the most recent we have seen, appear to conform closely to other Pine Ridge studies.

The area is largely populated by extremely poor, full blood families, and is characterized by inadequate roads and serious problems of sanitation, water availability, and housing. The White Clay population consists of 1,100 people in 196 households; over half are under the age of 20. The predominant settlement pattern consists of isolated cabins (65%), with variations of kinship-centered house clusters (20%) and village groupings (15%). Over half are bilingual in English and Lakota, and over two-thirds have never lived off the reservation. Only 66% of the White Clay children live with both parents in the household. Over two-thirds of the adult males with families have incomes under the poverty level of $3,000, and over 40% are unemployed (probably a low estimate reflecting very temporary OEO employment at the time of the study). Of those employed, 50% work for either the BIA or OEO. Approximately 80% of the Indian landowners in White Clay are either leasing or simply not using their land, and 42% of the population are currently on welfare rolls.

The level of education of the White Clay population is low by national standards: only 25% have completed elementary school. Ironically, the White Clay District has the highest concentration of college graduates on the reservation.

Loneman Day School

The Loneman School, which serves the White Clay District, is the product of a 1957 consolidation of three BIA day schools, serving five small communities within a radius of about 40 miles. Although the school was built to serve 150 pupils in grades 1-8, 230 students were enrolled during the 1967-1968 school year. Average daily attendance, however, was only 180. During the 1967-1968 school year, 23 children dropped out of school, while 19 enrolled at random

intervals throughout the year. At that time, the school had a staff of 11 teachers, with an annual turnover of 40%. Loneman teachers follow the usual age pattern found in BIA schools--either quite young or quite old, with few in between. In 1967-1968 the median age for this school's faculty was 53, with no teachers between the ages of 26 and 47.

Difficulties of daily life in the White Clay District are reflected in the philosophy of the former principal, who told us that he had to place equal emphasis on instruction, sanitation, nutrition, and transportation. The Loneman School has a policy of not assigning homework, as the one-room cabins the children live in provide no suitable space for study. The mobility of the Pine Ridge population presents additional problems. With most families engaged in seasonal agricultural labor, few children stay at one school for many years. Within the classroom, we observed the typical pattern described by Murray and Rosalie Wax and Robert Dumont--withdrawn, unresponsive, and noncompetitive children who communicate in monosyllables with the teacher.

The Loneman School has had more parent involvement than any other school on the reservation. A number of community group programs, such as Boy Scouts and 4H, and the school board are quite active. However, parent participation has come primarily from the area immediately surrounding the school, with minimal response from people living in the outlying districts which are as far as 40 miles away. The poorest, least educated people in the isolated traditional communities have still not been reached.

Development of the Community-Controlled School

When the Bureau of Indian Affairs began to close many of its day schools and to transfer students to larger consolidated schools, community-controlled schools were proposed as an alternative to the consolidated schools. The Indians were opposed to closing the smaller and more isolated schools of the Bureau because they also served as centers for community activities. As such, the schools were accessible and welcomed by the Indians. Many of the Oglala Sioux Indians considered approaching the Bureau of Indian Affairs to see if some kind of arrangement could be made so that the Indians could continue to operate the smaller schools. By assuming responsibility for the operation of the schools, the Oglala Sioux felt they could maintain their feeling of closeness and familiarity with the school and, at the same time, assure quality education for their children.

A second stimulus for community action may have been the initiation by the Federal Government of a number of programs and policies to stimulate minority groups to think about assuming more control and responsibility over their own affairs. One such program was the poverty program sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity. In addition, a new government policy toward Indian affairs was announced by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the Ten-Year Indian Development Program. According to Indian observers, the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs were apparently trying to meet the challenges implicit in the newly announced poverty program.

A third factor that may have influenced the Oglala Sioux tribal leaders was a plan submitted by the Shannon County Public School District, which includes a part of the Pine Ridge Reservation. The plan proposed to unify the public and the Bureau of Indian Affairs school systems by transferring the BIA-operated schools to the public school district at the beginning of the school year of 1967-1968. The proposal was made in accordance with the BIA policy developed

in the early 1950's to close Indian day schools and boarding schools when possible and to transfer the students to public schools.

The Loneman Demonstration School--Planning and Development

In early 1964, the first formal meeting was held to discuss the idea of designating one of the BIA schools as a demonstration school under the management of the local Indians. The meeting was organized and held at the Porcupine School under the leadership of Mr. William Whirlwind Horse, then serving as chairman of the Tribal Council. Two key speakers were Dr. Robert R. Roessel, Professor of Education at Arizona State University and Chairman of the President's Task Force on Indian Poverty, and Mr. Robert Dumont, an Assiniboine Sioux from the Fort Peck Indian Reservation. Dr. Roessel had long advocated active Indian participation in schools as an essential factor in developing successful educational programs for Indian children. His plans for community development centered on the school as a focal point for mobilizing an Indian community. Mr. Dumont reported on the Wax study of education on the Pine Ridge Reservation (published in 1964) in which he had participated as a researcher. The Wax report had concluded that the failure to educate Oglala Sioux children was due primarily to two reasons: (a) there was no communication between the school and the Indian community; and (b) within the classroom, Sioux students had developed techniques for completely isolating themselves from their teachers.

The Porcupine Day School, located approximately in the center of the Pine Ridge Reservation, was the site originally considered by the tribal leaders for the demonstration school. However, when the district and community leaders at Porcupine showed little support for the idea and the tribal leaders became involved in other concerns, the idea was abandoned.

When plans for the community-controlled school at Porcupine did not materialize, the leaders of the Oglala Junior Community in the White Clay District began promoting the idea in their district. It was not surprising that it was the Oglala Junior Community that began to pursue the idea of changing the traditional school system on the reservation. This community has the largest number of college graduates of any community on the reservation. The community is also populated by a majority of full blood Indians with close kinship and family ties, and is still ruled by the ancient and time-honored Oglala Sioux traditions.

After enlisting the support of the White Clay District leaders and the Education Committee of the Loneman School, the Oglala Junior Community leaders turned the detailed planning for the community-controlled school over to the Education Committee. The Education Committee submitted its recommendation to the Tribal Council and the Bureau of Indian Affairs early in 1966. The Committee stated, "While the focus of the Loneman Demonstration School is one of education, its framework is the total environment . . . the social, physical, and economic life of the area and all of its residents." The Committee report stressed the failure of schools to educate Indian children, pointing to the 70% dropout rate of high school students coming from the White Clay District. The 70% who dropped out of school generally remained in their small, isolated rural communities characterized by the traditional problems of poverty. The Committee also noted that the Indian communities were deprived of much needed leadership because those students who did complete high school tended to leave their communities.

The Education Committee proposed that the project be sponsored jointly by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Committee proposed that, under contract, the BIA would turn the Loneman School

plant over to the Oglala Sioux Tribe and would also provide the previously budgeted funds of approximately $150,000. The Office of Economic Opportunity would provide additional funding for special programs to be developed, as well as for the employment of specialists in education and local people who would serve as teacher aides, bus drivers, and instructors in language and culture. The Oglala Sioux Tribe would operate the school in a "manner demonstrating methods, materials, techniques, and procedures adapted to help the Sioux children obtain optimal results from their educational opportunities." According to the Sioux proposal, specific problems to be considered by the school would include: (a) teaching of English as a second language; (b) school-community relations and parental involvement in educational processes; (c) home and school visitation; (d) cultural identification; (e) native-language learning; (f) inservice training and staff orientation; (g) guidance and counseling; (h) adult education; and (i) auxiliary services.

The Loneman Demonstration School--The Position of the BIA

The take-over of the Loneman School was planned for the school year of 1966-1967. During the summer of 1966, the Education Committee and the leaders in the White Clay District were confident that the Bureau of Indian Affairs would negotiate a contract with them: local BIA officials had assured them that there would be no problem. Gerald One Feather, a college-educated Sioux from the Oglala Junior Community, resigned from his position as a member of the Vista training staff of Arizona State University and returned to Pine Ridge in order to assist in the transfer of the BIA school. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, however, indicated that the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council had not officially agreed to the proposal and that the BIA was thus unable to negotiate the contract. In compliance with the BIA stipulation, the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council unanimously passed a resolution on November 29, 1966 asking the BIA to "make its facilities, funds, and equipment available to the local people to carry on a demonstration school." The Council resolution also proposed that local people administer the funds and operations of the school for five years, at which time an evaluation would be made to determine the effectiveness of the approach.

The BIA superintendent in charge of the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation responded to the Council resolution in a letter dated January 3, 1967, stating that he had no objection to the resolution and its proposal. However, he cautioned that more information and planning were needed so that funds, procedures, and answers to any legal questions could be provided. He suggested that the proposal might be considered by the Reservation-wide Planning Committee (a Tribal Council subcommittee) as part of its long-range planning. The superintendent noted, "It has been the policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to transfer facilities when there is mutual readiness on the part of the parties concerned and the facilities at the Loneman Day School are very inadequate." The superintendent pointed out alternative plans that ought to be considered:

1. Plan a pilot program similar to the Rough Rock Demonstration School on the Navajo reservation;
2. Plan and organize a school district and operate it as an independent school district similar to a public school;
3. Continue to operate the school under the BIA system and provide the local Education Committee with inservice training for a specified period of time; provide additional facilities and updating of the school plant as soon as possible, and then plan transfer of the school to a local school board when there is mutual readiness.

One of the superintendent's recommendations was immediately put into effect. The education staff at the Pine Ridge BIA Agency announced a training program during the month of January 1967 for members of an advisory school board for the schools on the reservation. At a meeting held at the Loneman School, residents of the White Clay District selected seven members, including some from the Education Committee, who would compose the new Advisory School Board. The board members were to receive training in school administration through Black Hills Teachers College under a program set up under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The training program was conducted from January until April of 1967.

The response from the Aberdeen Area Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs regarding the plans for the Loneman School was much more negative. In a meeting held with the members of the Education Committee of the Loneman School in February 1967, the Area Director of Education, who once had served as a teacher in one of the day schools in the White Clay District, implied that the local Indians were no more ready to take over responsibilities for their own affairs than they had been some 30 years before when he had served in their community. He asked that the Committee provide him with concrete and specific details as to how it proposed to operate the school, including guidelines and policies, administrative procedures, curriculum planning, recruitment and training of teachers, and maintenance and development of the school plant and facilities. He also requested endorsements and commitments from organizations and institutions that would provide additional funding and technical assistance.

To comply with the request from the Area Office, the Education Committee obtained the services of Dr. Robert A. Roessel of the Rough Rock Demonstration School to assist in developing a proposal embodying the philosophy of a community-controlled school. Dr. Roessel visited the Pine Ridge Reservation at least three times during 1967.

The newly created and trained Indian Advisory School Board for the Loneman School then tried to negotiate a contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the summer of 1967 so that the Indians could assume operation of the school during the school year of 1967-1968. The Board was unsuccessful.

Interviews with the participants, both Indian and BIA, indicate that the Bureau of Indian Affairs officials were not opposed to the efforts that were being made by the Advisory School Board and its supporters to take control of the school. The BIA officials assured the Indians that they had every right to suggest and to propose changes in the school system; BIA officials were <u>not</u> convinced, however, that the Board was ready to take over <u>complete</u> responsibility for the school. In an effort to have the Board reconsider and possibly postpone its plans, the officials reiterated that the school had inadequate facilities and that the Bureau should turn over a school plant that was in good condition. The officials also suggested that new buildings might be added by the BIA, and that it might be difficult for the Board to acquire such building funds on its own in the future. BIA officials also maintained that there was no convincing evidence that all of the people served by the school were supportive of the group that was trying to take over the school.

Although there was no access to official correspondence on the matter, interviews with the education officials of the Aberdeen Area Office of the BIA did indicate some of the reasons behind their reluctance to transfer the school to the Indians. First, the officials stated that it was an area policy to transfer BIA schools to the public school system and not to any Indian groups.

Secondly, as mentioned before, some of the education personnel had taught at Pine Ridge, and one of them said that no change had taken place that would convince him that the Oglala Sioux Indians were ready to assume the responsibility of operating their own school. Finally, some area education officials felt the demonstration school was a scheme developed and promoted by a group of opportunistic and self-seeking Sioux politicians. The Reservation superintendent advocated restraint and caution, the need for further discussions and planning, and for more nearly complete agreement among the Indian people. He was aware of the divergent opinions of all concerned. He was also aware that establishment of the demonstration school could cause a prolonged period of turmoil in the complicated federal-tribal structure and in the political structure on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

Loneman Demonstration School Proposal--A Political Campaign Issue

During the fall of 1967, the Oglala Sioux Tribe was preparing for its biennial tribal election. The administration of Mr. Johnson Holy Rock, Chairman of the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council, was ending. He was being strongly challenged by Mr. Enos Poor Bear, whom Mr. Holy Rock had defeated in the 1966 election. One of the issues interjected into the political campaign was the demonstration school proposal at Loneman. Mr. Poor Bear charged the Holy Rock administration with manipulating existing programs and creating doubt and confusion in school affairs. A more specific accusation was that Mr. Holy Rock had obligated the tribe to purchase for $25,000 two trailers which were housing a Head Start class and the kindergarten class at Loneman.

The tribal elections were held about February 13, 1968. Mr. Enos Poor Bear defeated Mr. Johnson Holy Rock, and Mr. Bad Heart Bull, a member of the Executive Committee, a leader of the Oglala Junior Community, and a staunch supporter of the demonstration school, lost his seat on the Council. A short time later, Mr. Gerald One Feather, another supporter of the Loneman Demonstration School, was relieved as director of the Community Action Program.

The election followed the pattern of Pine Ridge politics with the "ins" going out and the "outs" coming in. There is a saying in Pine Ridge that the incoming administration spends six months straightening out the "mess" created by the previous party in power, six months planning and organizing its program, six months launching its program, and the last six months preparing for the next political campaign--with the result that nothing ever gets done. The spoils system rules the political life of the Oglala Sioux; the available jobs in the tribal administration are the rewards of a winning campaign. The newly elected Poor Bear administration was installed in office on April 10, 1968.

Defeat of Local Self-Control

Political defeat by opponents who had made a gainful issue of the demonstration school left the Loneman Advisory School Board in a quandary during the spring of 1968. When President Johnson issued a message on American Indians on March 7, 1968, the sagging morale of the School Board was given a much needed boost and hopes were renewed. In his statement, the President asked for the maximum involvement of Indian people in their affairs, calling for "self-help, self-development, and self-determination." He specifically mentioned the need to create Indian school boards of education which would be given increasing responsibilities in the operation of community schools. Hoping that it might be one of the first groups to benefit from the President's statement, the

Loneman Advisory School Board decided to submit its proposal to the Bureau of Indian Affairs once again, despite the opposition of the Tribal Council.

The President's message on American Indians had stimulated many discussions about the possibility of the Bureau of Indian Affairs contracting with Indian tribes and private organizations, including Indian organizations, to perform many of the Bureau services--in effect, decentralizing many of the BIA functions. By submitting its final Loneman Demonstration School proposal, the Indian Advisory School Board was posing a crucial question that held ramifications for other Indian tribes. Was the Bureau of Indian Affairs willing to negotiate and contract with local Indian groups on an Indian reservation for the performance of certain services without the sanction of the tribal council, and possibly, even in cases where the tribal council might be in opposition?

Until that time, it had been the practice of the Bureau of Indian Affairs as well as other agencies and organizations to contract and do business only with tribal councils under the assumption that a tribal council is representative of the Indians.* Despite the position of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the actions of tribal councils, in reality, are not always representative of the wishes of the tribe. Indeed, tribal councils are power structures that can be as guilty as any other political group, if they so choose, of using their power to perpetuate their status or oppress their constituents. The typical reservation Indian, poor and uneducated, is often too weak from many years of paternalism, oppression, and debilitating factionalism and conflicts to challenge his tribal council. Even if properly elected and sincere in intent, tribal governments are further limited in that many of their actions and powers are subject to approval or veto by the Secretary of the Interior. True self-government does not actually exist for the Indian tribes--rather the Indian tribes are wards under the jurisdiction of the United States Government.

On the Pine Ridge Reservation, the Tribal Council has not always been looked upon with favor. Members or heirs of the old Treaty Council, the predecessor of the present Tribal Council, never accepted the present form of government. Also the Tribal Council has pre-empted many of the powers traditionally the responsibility of the Tiospaye, the community or band government. In doing so, the Council has caused many conflicts over political jurisdiction.

An additional problem created by the political structure of the Pine Ridge Reservation is the frequency of elections. Generally, as mentioned above, the

---

*The Office of Economic Opportunity, for example, had emphasized the role of the Oglala Tribal Council and the personal objection of Mr. Poor Bear, its chairman, in its refusal to fund the proposed demonstration school. On April 12, two days after the Poor Bear administration took office, Dr. James Wilson, Director of the Indian Desk of OEO, had advised the Director of the Oglala Sioux Community Action Program that OEO would not fund the demonstration school: "For you to attempt to operate a demonstration school without the full endorsement of the [new] Tribal Council would seem to be devisive and self-defeating over a long period of time. A demonstration school project is difficult enough even with the support of a Tribal Council inasmuch as there will be at least three federal agencies (BIA, OEO, and USPHS) and the many residents of your local community involved." Dr. Wilson's decision was a major blow to the Loneman Demonstration School because its supporters had counted heavily on supplementary funding from OEO similar to that given to the Rough Rock Demonstration School.

administration changes every two years, with a resulting lack of continuity in programs. Programs are constantly the victims of political maneouvrings and of frequent changes in personnel.

In view of this complex situation, the Loneman Demonstration School advocates tried a new approach--a proposal that would still permit local Indian groups to assume some control over their affairs without having to reform their tribal government. The Indian Advisory School Board knew that their proposal had a precedent. The Bureau of Indian Affairs had contracted with Dine, Incorporated, a Navajo non-profit organization, to operate a federal boarding school at Rough Rock after fruitless attempts to involve the Navajo Tribal Council. The Advisory School Board proposed establishing a similar non-profit corporation at Pine Ridge.

On June 16, 1968, representatives from the White Clay District and the Loneman Advisory School Board met with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington, D. C. The delegation called attention to the proposals that had been sent to the Bureau of Indian Affairs two months before and requested a decision. The delegation also presented the Commissioner with a signed petition from 240 of the 280 voting members of the White Clay District, asking that the demonstration school proposal be approved. In making their request, the delegation reminded the Commissioner that their trip to Washington had not been sanctioned by the 1968 Tribal Council, and that the Tribal Council was opposed to turning the Loneman School over to the Advisory Board. The question posed by the delegation was whether the Bureau of Indian Affairs would recognize a local group such as the Advisory School Board as a legitimate contracting party. The delegation reported that the White Clay District had organized a non-profit corporation called "Oyate, Incorporated" to negotiate with the Bureau and to assume responsibility for the operation of the Loneman School. The Pine Ridge delegation emphasized how continuous conflict, uncertainty, and a lack of continuity in many worthwhile efforts were caused by the inevitable turnover of the tribal administration every two years. They argued that, in order to assure continuity and stability over a period of time, it was necessary to contract with independent local groups of Indians for various services traditionally performed by the Bureau. The Commissioner appeared to be sympathetic with the arguments presented by the delegation and promised them a definite decision before they left Washington. The delegation never heard directly from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

On June 26, 1968, the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council passed a resolution calling for a referendum vote on whether the Loneman School should be turned over to the local group for operation. Apparently the Tribal Council was acting in accordance with a decision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that no BIA schools would be turned over to local groups without a referendum.* The resolution stated that (a) a referendum was necessary because many of the people in the White Clay District were not properly informed of the implications of turning the control of a school over to "a group of opportunists"; and (b) the referendum was the only democratic way to resolve the issue.

---

*When the Loneman School delegation was in Washington, D. C., the Commissioner of the Indian Affairs had informed them that the Bureau would formally issue a statement clarifying the Bureau's policy for contracting with various groups for operating activities such as schools. In his message to the Bureau of the Budget in November 1968, the Commissioner stated that no BIA schools would be turned over to Indian groups without first ascertaining their wishes through a referendum election. The substance of his statement is contained in a BIA publication called "Guidelines for Tribes."

Although the referendum did provide a democratic way of ascertaining the desires of the people in the White Clay District, it also turned the proposed demonstration School into a political ploy. Political forces on the Pine Ridge Reservation thus had the opportunity to destroy in a few weeks a project that had been in process of developing for at least four years. The most important defect of the referendum, however, was that it was restricted to the White Clay District and excluded several communities which were outside the district, but which were served, nonetheless, by the Loneman School. The restriction of the referendum to the political lines of the district rather than to the area actually served by the school led the Advisory School Board to suspect that political intrigue was involved. Although protests were made before the referendum was held, they were to no avail. Some patrons of the school were not allowed to vote and their participation may have meant the difference between success and defeat.

The referendum was held in the White Clay District on August 8, 1968. The proposal was rejected by a vote of 131 to 104. The results of the referendum came as a complete surprise to the supporters of the demonstration school. They had been confident that a majority of the people would vote in favor of the proposal because of the favorable reaction received at several community meetings and from canvassing community leaders, and because approximately 86% of the voters in the White Clay District had signed their petition supporting the school in June.

A survey conducted the day after the referendum revealed some of the reasons for the project's defeat:

1. Strong opposition from the Tribal Council and the Council members from the White Clay District;

2. Development of a parents-teachers organization which opposed the Advisory School Board;

3. Fear of terminating federal supervision over Indian Affairs;

4. Fear of possible violation of treaty rights;

5. Concern about the cost of running the school if it meant that the local Indians would have to support the school through increased taxation.

Some of the negative votes also seemed to have been cast in line with long-standing rivalries among Indian groups within the White Clay District. The resounding defeat of the proposed demonstration school seemed to be based not only on opposition to the school innovation itself, but also upon a fear of change in the life of the community. Since the early 1950's when the BIA first developed as a policy the goal of terminating Indian reservations and communities, the technique of arousing fear of change or termination has been used repeatedly by Indian groups to oppose any kind of change on the reservations. It was effectively used again in this referendum.

Observations from the Case Study

The experience of the Loneman Advisory School Board makes it quite clear that effective assumption of responsibility for Indian education by Indians themselves will not be easily achieved by a local community group. In many instances,

Indian groups have neither the experience nor the training necessary for the task. They have had little experience with formal educational structures, and they are not used to working with the entire community to accomplish a program which is often controversial.

Secondly, it is presently unclear whether the Bureau of Indian Affairs is really interested in turning over some of its control to local Indian groups, or whether it is just attempting to respond minimally to immediate pressure and to popular demands. It is also possible that the Bureau sees community control only as a temporary prelude to transferring responsibility for the educational system to some other governmental agency, either state or federal.

Thirdly, any community group attempting to develop a school or educational program for the community must be extremely sensitive to, and able to deal effectively with, the various conflicting forces both within and without the tribal structure that have a stake in the transfer of responsibility. These groups include the tribal government, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the operations of the Office of Economic Opportunity, missionaries and traders on the reservation, and informally organized tribal factions.

Finally, the concern of Indians about the effect of their actions on the status of treaties and their quasi-sovereign position may, in some instances, be well justified. In fact, real change in control of Indian education may have ramifications for the entire policy of the Federal Government with respect to Indian affairs.

CASE STUDY III—STEWART BOARDING SCHOOL

Stewart Indian School located in Carson City, Nevada is a striking example of what is wrong with education for Indian children in the United States. Stewart is the terminal point of a system that fails to educate the majority of the children who pass through its institutions. The tragedy of the school is that no one individual is responsible and yet everyone involved contributes to its failure. The major responsibility for this tragedy, however, must rest with the Federal Government and with its agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Our visit to the Stewart Boarding School in 1969 indicated the following:

1. Attendance: Of the 525 children from 12 years of age to over 20 who attended Stewart, 80% were there because someone had said that they had a social or psychological problem that could be handled better at Stewart than in a local BIA or public school. The remaining 20% of the children were at Stewart because there was no local high school available on the Hopi and Papago reservations where they lived. The students themselves said they were sent to Stewart because of its isolation: they cannot run away nor can they go home too frequently. For some students, going to Stewart is a family tradition. Their parents equate the present-day Stewart with the boarding school they attended, unaware that a Stewart education is no longer adequate to prepare their children for life in a highly complex world.

2. Test Results: Achievement test scores for the 1968-1969 twelfth-grade class at Stewart showed an average achievement in English language skills at the ninth-grade level (9.2 exactly) with a variation from the fifth-grade level to the twelfth-grade level; only one student out of 106 obtained a score of 12. Of the class of 1967, 12 students went on to a college or junior college.

   Total test scores (grade equivalents) for the California Achievement Test given to Stewart children during the school year of 1968-1969 were:

Stewart	sixth grade	CAT grade equivalent of 5.2
	seventh grade	5.8
	eighth grade.	7.1
	ninth grade	7.0
	tenth grade	7.5
	eleventh grade.	8.3
	twelfth grade	8.4

   Thus, according to CAT scores the entering sixth-graders at Stewart were academically retarded by about one year, and graduating seniors were retarded by more than three years.

3. Curriculum: The curriculum was described as academic and vocational. In reality, the academic program was a diluted conventional high school course of studies. The first-level mathematics course was designed to teach addition and subtraction. The second-level course dealt with all four basic operations plus fractions. The third-year course was concerned with proportions for simple algebra, while the most advanced course was algebra.

   All vocational programs, except for house and sign painting, were non-terminal. Boys were rotated from one vocational specialty to another--

drafting, carpentry, welding, sheet metal and machine shop, electricity and electronics, painting, and farm work--until the junior year. These courses were all on the introductory level. After the first three years, boys spent one half of each school day in a vocation--either wood shop, metal shop, painting, or farm work. There were no facilities to continue the other trades. The boys who did best were encouraged to take painting and carpentry, while the "low achievers" were placed in general farm work and heavy equipment operation. The girls had only two fields to choose from: general and home service (domestic work) or "hospital ward attendant" training, which the girls considered a degrading farce--a euphemism for more domestic work.

4. Post-school Success: Follow-up data on Stewart graduates were entirely inadequate. School records listed only the placement of most graduating seniors. There were no data on the success of Stewart graduates in post-graduate schools or in jobs.

   Dropout figures were confusing. Information provided by the schools indicated that of 29 students who had left Stewart during the past school year, 7 simply had gone home and never returned, 8 had been withdrawn by parents, 2 had transferred to public high schools, 3 had been expelled as behavior problems, 2 had been discharged for health reasons, 4 had left school because of pregnancy, and 3 had been ordered back to Arizona by their probation boards after involvement in burglary.

5. Faculty: There were 40 teachers at Stewart. One had no degree of any kind, 7 had high school diplomas, 22 had bachelor's degrees, and 10 (25%) of the faculty held master's degrees. One-quarter of the faculty were long-term BIA employees with an average of 22 years of service. The average age of the teachers was 43, and 5 were over 60.

   The principal of Stewart had no authority in the selection of teachers for the school. He was dependent on an Area Office of the BIA which uses a limited civil service registry from which teachers are selected without consideration of their suitability for the individual school. Thus, the principal had no possibility for choosing teachers with special knowledge of Indian children, skill in dealing with problem children, or ability in remedial instruction. Teachers were not even informed about the special problems they would face prior to accepting a position in the school. Teachers at Stewart met classes of 15 to 30 children five or six periods a day. The smaller classes were vocational; teachers of the academic subjects bore the heavier teaching loads. The Stewart staff itself felt that under these conditions teachers could not even begin to deal with the special problems of their students.

6. Counseling and Guidance: The Stewart guidance staff consisted of eight people, three of whom had master's degrees. Three were over 60, while the rest were under 35. Only two of the counselors actually served in that capacity and they were located in a separate guidance building. The other six served in administrative capacities in the dormitories. Counseling and guidance functions seemed to be thoroughly confused. All members of the staff advised students as to their best possibilities for future schooling and employment, helped settle disputes between students and teachers, and counseled students on personal problems. Psychological assistance to students consisted of discussions

with the two counselors mentioned above who held office "open house" for two hours every day, and a series of films on life problems. The guidance building included a number of rooms which were available for free creative activities, such as painting, drawing, and wood carving. The two counselors complained that their effectiveness was greatly inhibited by the dormitory-based counselors and aides who were ignorant of the "psychological" approach of the guidance staff toward student problems, and who insisted rather on strict, punitive discipline.

7. Residences: There were 23 dormitory aides at Stewart with an aide/student ratio of 1/26. The aides had all acquired high school diplomas, and averaged 42 years of age. One was over 60; two were over 70.

   The students' dormitory and social life operated under demeaning rules and punitive discipline (i.e., boys and girls, many over 18, could "promenade and hold hands" from 4:30 to 5:30 under the observation of dormitory matrons, but they could not step off the sidewalks onto the grass, or lean against buildings during this time). In addition, it was the common practice for faculty members to hire students as domestic house workers. Considering these factors as well as the generally low social status of the jobs for which the students were trained (domestic, ward attendant, house painter), the students' self-deprecation and their low expectations of themselves as Indians were not surprising.

During the past few years, researchers have constantly reiterated that one of the primary functions of education for American Indian children is to develop a positive self-image in the Indian children. Stewart has failed in this task. Our interviews with Stewart students showed us that the students were aware that Stewart was an "easy" school, and that they would have to attend post-graduate institutions to get adequate job training. Some students did appear to be shocked, however, when they were told by one of the investigators that they were not learning the course content usually prescribed for their grade.

Administrators seemed to contribute to the myth that the students were obtaining a high school education. One Stewart administrator stated: "When a child comes here in the eighth grade but is doing fifth-grade work, we can't place him in the fifth grade. The child and the parents would think something is wrong with the school so we keep them in the grade they are in and promote them each year until they graduate." While obviously the students were not completely misled, there was some indication from our interviewers that some Indian students wanted to believe the myth that they were obtaining an adequate education at Stewart. Students seemed apathetic--feeling that Stewart was "good enough for us"--meaning good enough for Indians who are, by their definition (and the school's) incapable of meeting the standards of other schools.

The major problem at Stewart is that no one seems or wants to recognize the fact that Stewart is a specialized school dealing almost exclusively with problem children who are low achievers. The academic cost per child was between $550 and $600 in the 1967-1968 school year and the budget decreased for 1968-1969. A remedial program would cost twice this amount. However, until an appropriate educational program is developed for Stewart's Indian students with adequate remedial instruction and adequate vocational and academic programs, Stewart will remain the tragedy that it is today.

PROBLEMS OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS EDUCATION

We found confusion and poor communication among the various levels of the BIA system in regard to educational policy, establishing relationships with the public school system and with Indian communities, and use of federal funds. Often, when firm guidelines from the Washington office were needed, we found a lack of uniformity; or conversely, when flexibility in dealing with local problems was needed, we found inflexibility. A few brief examples will illustrate the confusion within the Bureau of Indian Affairs itself.

The presence of poor communication among the various levels of the BIA was manifested by conflicting reports of the boarding schools in Oklahoma. One of our staff members interviewed students at three Oklahoma-based Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools--Chilocco, Riverside and Fort Sill. She reported a high degree of tension and uneasiness as a result of mass drunkenness, fighting, and increasingly violent feuds among tribal groups at the schools. Students at the Chilocco Boarding School were concerned with increasing drunkenness and physical punishment meted out for infractions of rules, including internment in solitary confinement. At Riverside Boarding School, a near riot had occurred with the jailing of some 15 to 17 boys. Several seniors had been expelled from school. Students' interviews showed that they were concerned about fights, drunkenness, jail sentences, raising bail money, parole, probation, etc., leading the observer to think that she was talking to some petty criminals who were always in and out of jail.

When another staff member asked the Assistant Commissioner of BIA for Education if he were aware that conditions at the Oklahoma boarding schools might be embarrassing if picked up by the news media, he responded with a puzzled frown and the remark, "Is that right?" When the same query was made to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, he responded that he was making every effort to visit BIA installations throughout the country, that he believed his office had close contact with all field BIA offices, and that he would know immediately if uncontrollable situations developed. Yet, the boarding schools at Chilocco, Riverside, and Fort Sill continued to exist unchanged.

The area offices of the BIA reported conflicting views on the future status of BIA-operated schools, reflecting a lack of guidelines from the main office. The Area Director of Education at Aberdeen, South Dakota stated that the BIA policy was to transfer the BIA students to public schools as rapidly as possible rather than to locally controlled schools. He said, "We are not about ready to transfer our schools to a bunch of illiterate Indians." He was obviously referring to the Rough Rock School in Arizona and its native-speaking Board of Education.

On the other hand, the Area Director at Phoenix, Arizona stated that it was the policy of his office to transfer BIA schools to any Indian group that requested, and was in a position, to operate the school. He stated that the Blackwater Day School on the Gila River Indian Reservation near Phoenix had been transferred to an Indian Board of Education during the past year. He said, however, "We didn't tell the Washington office what we were doing, and when they found out about it they hit the ceiling. We didn't ask them because we didn't feel it was within their jurisdiction." The Area Director at Albuquerque expressed his desire and willingness to transfer any activity of the BIA, including operation of schools, to any Indian group which was organized and ready to assume the responsibility. He reported that he had sent out instructions to the various agencies under his jurisdiction to prepare to contract with Indian groups

for providing services usually performed by the BIA. The Albuquerque director said that his main difficulty was convincing line staff, including some reservation superintendents, that Indians could act responsibly.

A similar lack of uniformity exists in the use of federal funds. Area directors in New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and Montana all reported different application of Johnson O'Malley funds (federal support for public schools serving Indian children). The Albuquerque Director reported that he had finally succeeded in establishing an office that would have responsibility for working out programs to be conducted by schools using Johnson O'Malley funds, for informing and involving Indian leaders in budget formulations, and generally for providing observers to see that Indian children were receiving benefits of the programs as designed by the various school districts. The Phoenix Area Director of Education, on the other hand, said that his office could not report specifically where Johnson O'Malley funds had been spent in Arizona since the funds went into the general funds of the state. In Nevada, however, the Johnson O'Malley funds were spent for specified items such as school lunches and special education classes. The Billings Area Director reported that Johnson O'Malley funds in Montana were under the jurisdiction of the State Coordinator for Indian Education and that the funds were allocated primarily for school lunches and a special pilot transportation project. The differences in handling Johnson O'Malley funds again reflect the absence of guidelines from the Washington office of the BIA. Area directors, however, were uniformly concerned with the main office's predilection for cutting back educational funds after allocations had already been made. During the school year of 1968-1969, two cutbacks in funds were ordered. This squeeze on funds plus a freeze on employment contributed to the chaotic conditions in the schools.

Although there were differences in each BIA area director's conduct of educational programs, the curriculum and materials (such as textbooks) appeared to be the same in all schools, indicating that in the area of curriculum the central office was firmly in control. However, most teachers agreed that the curriculum should be designed for particular groups and areas, and that materials more pertinent to the students' experience should be used. They were, however, somewhat at a loss to explain to whom their recommendations should be made.

More flexibility in the educational program seemed most essential in some of the boarding schools we visited. These schools, which include both junior and senior high schools, present themselves as accredited institutions preparing their students for postgraduate vocational schools or colleges and universities. The truth is that they are institutions serving many kinds of children: those who have been classified as having social and psychological problems; those whom local schools have written off as failures; and those for whom there is no local school to attend. Often, a school will have all of these groups of students at the same time. Yet, no one has identified the fact that many of the boarding schools should be specialized schools dealing with problem children, requiring highly trained personnel and ample resources, as well as specialized instructional programs.

Finally, the observation of the area directors of the BIA which most concerned us was that, during the past five years, they could report nothing significantly new in Indian education which had resulted from policies developed by the Washington office of the BIA. Occasionally, innovative programs, such as the transfer of the Blackwater School, were begun by an area director acting on his own initiative. Most innovative programs originated in the Office of Economic Opportunity or in the Office of Education. Generally, the BIA appears to have focused on the administration of educational programs for Indians (with

varying degrees of success and consistency)--programs which are often out-of-date, inappropriate, inadequately funded, and implemented by inadequately trained personnel--rather than on the development of new educational policies and programs which would be more suited to the needs of today's Indian population.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the conclusions drawn from our two-year study of Indian education--namely, (a) that present classrooms are poorly adapted to the Indian child, and (b) that it is absolutely necessary that Indian communities be allowed to assume major responsibility for the education of their children--we make the following recommendations to government agencies, private foundations, and research interests.

Government

1. We recommend the creation of a Federal Commission to assume control of Indian education, with an explicit mandate to transfer this control to Indian communities within five years, after which the Commission would cease to exist.

The Commission would assume responsibility for the following: (a) providing legal services to expedite the transfer of control of education to Indian communities; (b) training Indian educators to administer and staff the schools; (c) providing consultant assistance to Indian school boards toward establishing and operating a local school system; (d) providing funds for revising curricula to reflect the history, culture, and values of the Indian people the schools serve; and (e) serving as a conduit for federal support funds, including Johnson O'Malley funds.

The Commission should study three models which now exist for the transfer of control over education to Indian communities: the Rough Rock Demonstration School which is operated by Dine, Incorporated, a Navajo non-profit organization; the Blackwater School on the Gila River Pima Indian Reservation in Arizona where an all-Indian School Board of Education has assumed responsibility for a former BIA day school; and the Tama Community School to be operated by the Tama Indian Community beginning with the 1969-1970 school year. (The BIA had planned to close this school and to transfer the students to a nearby public school. The Mesquakie Indians of Tama Indian Community protested, and succeeded in getting a court order sustaining the school.)

The Commission should define "community" in a flexible manner. The Commission could conceivably transfer control to local groups such as Head Start parents advisory committees, tribal councils, or intertribal organizations such as the Arizona Indian Development Association or the California Indian Education Association.

We consider the following factors to be favorable to adoption of the specific method of control transfer which we have recommended above:

- The time limit of five years is long enough to insure that the transfer of control will be orderly, and yet short enough to reassure the Indian people that the change will occur quickly.

- The limited life and purpose of the Commission will avoid the problem of replacing one vested-interest bureaucracy with another.

- With adequate support for training administrators, teachers, and school board members, for revising curriculum, and for introducing educational innovations, the Federal Government can transfer the schools to local people in a manner that will greatly enhance the schools' chances for success.

- This proposal will not prevent mistakes from being made in the provision of education for Indian children. However, the mistakes will be made by the Indian people themselves, and not by a federal bureaucracy. Considering that our analysis has shown that, in the past, education for Indians was largely a failure, we do not feel that the mistakes made by the Indian communities would make the situation any worse than it is now.

2. We recommend that, in the interim until the Commission is initiated, there be an alteration in the criteria used within the Bureau of Indian Affairs for making decisions about promotions and financial rewards.

Rather than rewarding field personnel for accurate reporting and tight administration as is now the general practice, rewards should be granted by the degree to which the recipient has: (a) successfully involved members of the Indian community in decision-making at the highest level; (b) transferred some of his responsibilities to Indians; (c) increased the number of Indians holding responsible positions; and (d) encouraged experimentation and innovation. If these criteria were applied to all aspects of the BIA's operations, the result should be an increase in the opportunity local Indian people have to govern their own affairs, at least to the extent that similar opportunities exist for non-Indian communities.

3. In the interim until the Commission is formed, we recommend changes in the procedures of recruiting and selecting educational personnel within the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The standards of the education profession rather than those of the civil service should determine who shall teach Indian children. Currently, principals must accept a staff chosen by the BIA area office from civil service registries; as a result, principals are often burdened by poorly qualified teachers who are unadaptable to the special conditions inherent in teaching Indian children.

4. In the interim, we recommend that a definite statement of goals and purposes be made for each of the boarding schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

We recommend that the boarding schools be converted to special-purpose institutions such as terminal vocational centers, academic high schools, remedial and special education centers, junior colleges, special subject schools (such as the Sante Fe Institute for American Indian Art) or regional schools rather than maintain their confused and archaic status as mixed academic, remedial, and disciplinary institutions.

We wish to be perfectly clear and explicit that the above recommendations are not intended in any way to support "termination." We feel that Indian communities have the right to their present legal privileges and immunities for as long as they wish to perpetuate them, and that it is the responsibility of the Congress as well as the Indian communities to see that these rights are protected.

Private Foundations

1. We recommend that the foundations provide direct support to responsible groups of local Indians involved in educational concerns.

At present, foundations often support large national organizations in which grant monies are spent on bureaucratic operations and overhead expenses. The groups of parents currently organized on many reservations, such as Head Start advisory groups and the advisory school boards for BIA schools, are in many cases anxious to extend their roles in the operation of educational programs, and require the latitude given by direct financing to formulate plans and initiate pilot projects. Direct financing also promotes the kind of responsible operations and attitudes which must be developed if Indian communities are ever to become independent from external bureaucratic control. We recommend that indirect financing be limited to research of the type which we will describe subsequently, and to programs of consultant assistance to Indian communities.

2. We recommend the support of those research and development projects which will involve the Indian communities at large in educational thought and action.

   As examples, we would cite the following:

   A. Community self-studies which accomplish the dual purpose of training local Indian people in the techniques of interviewing, questionnaire preparation and administration, bibliographic and documentary research, and data analysis, while also promoting sophisticated understanding by local people of the operations of their own community life. Thus, both skills and knowledge indispensable to the administration of community affairs are developed concomitant with the accumulation of valuable data for the social sciences. This type of project also provides latitude for Indian people to develop new and indigenous models for research inquiry which may prove to be more effective than current professional techniques.

   B. Educational materials libraries, such as the parent-teacher operated "toy libraries" utilized by the Far West Laboratory. The child's use of educational toys in the home is extended in this type of project to include training parents to observe the growth fostered by use of toys and to participate in learning experiences with their children. Parents thus become involved in basic and conscious processes of education, and interact to a greater extent with each other and with teachers in educational concerns.

3. We recommend that the foundations provide funds for the training and placement of young Indian leaders in research and development projects.

   We particularly suggest internship programs in which young men and women could gain field experience in educational affairs, be of service to their communities, and, at the same time, obtain the academic credentials necessary for educational positions at the highest level.

4. We recommend that the foundations sponsor compensatory evening or summer programs to bolster the written and computational skills which reservation Indians have little chance to develop or practice.

   These skills are invaluable not only for responsible self-government on the reservation, but for life off the reservation, where Indians must deal with the unfamiliar operations of insurance, hospital bills, and taxes.

5. We recommend that the foundations fund a central clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of information on research and action projects in Indian communities across the country.

At present, not only are people involved in action research generally uninformed of similar activities in other parts of the country, but Indians within the sites of research projects are often completely uninformed as to the purposes and results of research which directly concerns them.

Research Interests

1. We recommend that future research in Indian communities include an action element oriented to community needs, and that members of the community be as closely involved in the planning and operation of such projects as is possible.

We have heard Indians express tremendous resentment that the vast amount of research done in their communities has neither been communicated to them, nor has it been organized to be of benefit to them. We must reiterate that action programs be initiated and planned by the community from the beginning. Researchers must not allow themselves to drift into the easy paternalistic roles often desired of them by the community itself. Indian people have too long been encouraged to ask "experts" for advice rather than to formulate their own plans; they have, therefore, never had a real stake in the programs arranged by others for their benefit--programs which have often floundered as soon as the "experts" left the scene. Directional advice, no matter how informed and well-meaning, must be avoided at the commencement of programs until the community has formulated its own goals and set its own course of action.

2. We recommend that where possible Indian communities formulate their own research areas and designs for presentation to funding and research groups.

The Indian communities are thus elevated from the status of experimental "guinea pig" to that of research partner.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ablon, J. Relocated American Indians in the San Francisco Bay Area. Human Organization, 1964, 33, 296-304.

2. Abrahams, I. Vocational interest of selected Indian college students as measured by the Kuder Preference Record. Journal of American Indian Education, 1962, 2, 20-24.

3. Adams, L. L. A follow-up study of Indian graduates of Union High School, Roosevelt, Utah. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1965.

4. Adkins, R. A study of the social composition and educational background of the Indian service teachers in the Aberdeen area 1954-1955. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1955.

5. Ala, V. The problems related to the assimilation of the Indian of South Dakota. Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Dakota, 1949.

6. Anderson, K., Collister, E. & Ladd, C. The educational achievement of Indian children. Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1953.

7. Arizona State Department of Public Instruction. Reports of annual conferences of the Coordinating Council for Research in Indian Education. Phoenix: Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, 1961-1963.

8. Artichoker, J. & Palmer, N. The Sioux Indian goes to college. Institute of Indian Studies, University of South Dakota, 1959.

9. Bayne, S. L. Motivating Navaho children. Journal of American Indian Education, 1969, 8, 1-10.

10. Benedict, R. Patterns of culture. New York: Penguin Books, 1947.

11. Bernardoni, L. C. Apache parents and vocational choice. Journal of American Indian Education, 1963, 2, 1-8.

12. Boggs, S. T. Culture change and the personality of Ojibwa children. American Anthropologist, 1958, 60.

13. Boyer, R. Social structure and socialization among the Apaches of the Mescalero Reservation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1962.

14. Branchard, R. J. A comparative study of the intermediate grades of two Indian schools and two public schools in Rolette County. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1953.

15. Brophy, W., & Aberle, S. The Indian: America's unfinished business. Report of the Commission on the Rights, Liberties, and Responsibilities of the American Indian. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966.

16. Bruner, E. M. Primary group experience and the process of acculturation. American Anthropologist, 1956, 58, 605-623.

17. Bryde, J. F. The Sioux Indian student: A study of scholastic failure and personality conflict. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1965.

18. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Report to the Secretary of the Interior Task Force on Indian Affairs. Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department or the Interior, 1961.

19. California State Advisory Commission on Indian Affairs. Report on Rural and Reservation Indians in California. Sacramento: California State Advisory Commission on Indian Affairs, 1966.

20. Charles, C. M. A science-mythology relationship among Indian children. The Journal of Educational Research, 1964, 37, 261-264.

21. Conklin, P. Good day at Rough Rock. American Education, February, 1967.

22. Coombs, L. M. Doorway toward the light. The story of the special Navajo education program. Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1962.

23. Coombs, L. M. Implications of the achievement level of Indian students. Report given at the Annual Conference of the Coordinating Council for Research in Indian Education. Mimeographed. Phoenix: Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, 1961.

24. Coombs, L. M., Kron, R. E., Collister, E. G., & Anderson, K. E. The Indian child goes to school. A study of interracial differences. Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1958.

25. Debo, A. The rise and fall of the Choctaw Republic, 1934.

26. Dickeman, M. The integrity of the Cherokee student. A paper presented to the Society for Applied Anthropology, 1967.

27. Dickeman, M. In E. Leacock (Ed.), The culture of poverty: A critique. New York: Simon and Schuster, in press.

28. Downing, L. The comparison-reference process as it relates to ninth grade Indian and non-Indian boys of low socio-economic status. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1965.

29. Dumont, R. Cherokee families and the schools. Mimeographed. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, 1967.

30. Eicher, C. An approach to income improvement on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation. Human Organization, 1964, 20, 191.

31. Erikson, E. Childhood and society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963.

32. Feraca, S. E. The history and development of Oglala Sioux tribal government. Unpublished manuscript, 1964.

33. Hagen, E. E., & Shaw, L. The Sioux on the reservations: The American colonial problem. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute Technology, 1960.

17. Bryde, J. F. The Sioux Indian student: A study of scholastic failure and personality conflict. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1965.

18. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Report to the Secretary of the Interior Task Force on Indian Affairs. Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1961.

19. California State Advisory Commission on Indian Affairs. Report on Rural and Reservation Indians in California. Sacramento: California State Advisory Commission on Indian Affairs, 1966.

20. Charles, C. M. A science-mythology relationship among Indian children. The Journal of Educational Research, 1964, 37, 261-264.

21. Conklin, P. Good day at Rough Rock. American Education, February, 1967.

22. Coombs, L. M. Doorway toward the light. The story of the special Navajo education program. Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1962.

23. Coombs, L. M. Implications of the achievement level of Indian students. Report given at the Annual Conference of the Coordinating Council for Research in Indian Education. Mimeographed. Phoenix: Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, 1961.

24. Coombs, L. M., Kron, R. E., Collister, E. G., & Anderson, K. E. The Indian child goes to school. A study of interracial differences. Bureau of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1958.

25. Debo, A. The rise and fall of the Choctaw Republic, 1934.

26. Dickeman, M. The integrity of the Cherokee student. A paper presented to the Society for Applied Anthropology, 1967.

27. Dickeman, M. In E. Leacock (Ed.), The culture of poverty: A critique. New York: Simon and Schuster, in press.

28. Downing, L. The comparison-reference process as it relates to ninth grade Indian and non-Indian boys of low socio-economic status. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1965.

29. Dumont, R. Cherokee families and the schools. Mimeographed. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, 1967.

30. Eicher, C. An approach to income improvement on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation. Human Organization, 1964, 20, 191.

31. Erikson, E. Childhood and society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963.

32. Feraca, S. E. The history and development of Oglala Sioux tribal government. Unpublished manuscript, 1964.

33. Hagen, E. E., & Shaw, L. The Sioux on the reservations: The American colonial problem. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute Technology, 1960.

A

34. Hamblin, J. R. A study of some of the important factors which encourage Indian students in the Apache and Navajo counties in Arizona to seek a higher education after high school graduation. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1963.

35. Havighurst, R. J. Education among American Indians: Individual and cultural aspects. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1957, 311, 105-115.

36. Havighurst, R. J., & Neugarten, B. L. American Indians and white children. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

37. Havighurst, R. J., Gunther, M. K., & Pratt, E. Environment and the Draw-a-man Test: The performance of Indian children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1946, 41, 50-63.

38. Havighurst, R. J., & Hilkevich, R. R. The intelligence of Indian children as measured by a performance scale. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1944, 39, 419-433.

39. Hoyt, E. E. An approach to the mind of the young Indian. Journal of American Indian Education, 1961, 1, 17-23.

40. Joseph, A., Spicer, R., & Chesky, J. The desert people. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

41. Keach, E. T., Jr., Fulton, R., & Gardner, W. E. Education and social crisis--perspectives on teaching disadvantaged youth. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

42. Kelly, W. Social and cultural considerations in the development of manpower programs for Indians. Tucson: Bureau of Ethnic Research, University of Arizona, 1967.

43. Kerchoff, A. Anomie and achievement motivation. Social Forces, 1959, 37, 196-202.

44. Kluckhohn, C., & Leighton, D. The Navajo. (Rev. ed.) Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1962.

45. Kneller, G. Educational anthropology: An introduction. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

46. Krush, T., et al. Some thoughts on the foundation of personality disorder: A study of an Indian boarding school population. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1966, 122, 868-876.

47. Lee, K. H. A comparison of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades of six schools in Sioux County, North Dakota, and Corson County, South Dakota. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1953.

48. Lindsay, B. The relationship between certain personality factors and academic achievement of Fort Hall Indian students. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1956.

49. Lloyd, D. O. Comparison of standardized test results of Indians and non-Indians in an integrated school system. Journal of American Indian Education, 1961, 1, 8-16.

50. Macgregor, G. Warriors without weapons. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.

51. McGrath, G. D., et al. Higher education of southwestern Indians with reference to success and failure. Tempe: Arizona State University, 1962.

52. Madigan, L. The American Indian relocation program. Association of American Indian Affairs, Inc., 1956.

53. Martin, H. Correlates of adjustment among American Indians in an urban environment. Human Organization, 1964, 23, 290-295.

54. Matthies, B. Independence training, hostility, and values as correlates of the achievement of white and Indian students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers' College, 1965.

55. Mercer, V. The efficiency of bilingual children in understanding analogies in the English language. Unpublished master's thesis, University of New Mexico, 1960.

56. Miller, F. C., & Caulkins, D. D. Chippewa adolescents: A changing generation. Human Organization, 1964, 23, 150-159.

57. Nash, P. Untitled. A paper presented at the Pennsylvania State University Conference on Indian Education, May, 1967.

58. New Mexico Highlands University. Psycho-social adjustment in an Indian boarding school. November 20, 1964.

59. Paxton, S. G. A study of the composite self-concept of the southwestern Indian adolescent. Indian Education, Issue 429-S, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, February 15, 1966.

60. Peterson, A. A. How well are Indian children educated? U. S. Indian Service, Department of the Interior, 1948.

61. Ray, C. K. A program of education for Alaskan natives. College: University of Alaska, 1959.

62. Ray, C. K., Ryan, J., & Parker, S. Alaskan native secondary school dropouts: A research report. College: University of Alaska, 1959.

63. Reifel, B. Cultural factors in social adjustment. Indian Education, Issue 298, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, April 15, 1957.

64. Ridgeway, C. W. A philosophy of curriculum for Papago Indian day schools. Unpublished master's thesis, Arizona State University, 1951.

65. Roessel, R. A., Jr. Handbook for Indian education. Los Angeles: Amerindian Publishing Company, 1962.

66. Roessel, R. A., Jr. Indian communities in action. Tempe: Arizona State University, 1967.

67. Ross, W. T., & Ross, G. V. Backgrounds of vocational choice: An Apache study, Mescalero Reservation. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1957, 35, 270-275.

68. Rusco, E. Minority groups in Nevada. Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Nevada, 1965.

69. Snider, G. O., & Coladarci, A. P. Intelligence test performance of acculturated Indian children. California Journal of Educational Research, 1960, 11, 34-36.

70. Sonnichsen, C. The Mescalero Apache. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958.

71. Spindler, G. Sociocultural and psychological processes in Menomini acculturation. University of California Publications in Culture and Society, Vol. V. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.

72. Stewart, O. Questions regarding American Indian criminality. Human Organization, 1964, 23, 61.

73. Tax, S. Untitled. A paper presented at the American Indian Chicago Conference, 1960.

74. Thomas, R. K. Colonialism, classic and internal. New University Thought, 1967, 4.

75. Thompson, H., et al. Education for cross-cultural enrichment. Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Institute, 1964.

76. Thompson, L. Culture in crisis: A study of the Hopi Indians. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

77. Thompson, L. Perception patterns in three Indian tribes. Psychiatry, 1951, 14, 255.

78. Tireman, L. S., & Zintz, M. V. Factors influencing learning of a second language. Education, 1961, 81, 310-313.

79. Tyler, S. L. Indian affairs: A study of the changes in the policy of the United States toward Indians. Provo: Institute of American Indian Studies, Brigham Young University, 1964.

80. United States Senate. Hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 90th Congress. U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

81. Useem, R. M. The aftermath of defeat: A study of acculturation among the Rosebud Sioux in South Dakota. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1947.

82. Wahrhaftig, A. Community and the caretakers. New University Thought, 1966-1967, 4, 54-76.

83. Wax, M. American Indian education as a cultural transaction. Teachers College Record, 1963, 64, 693-704.

84. Wax, M., & Wax, R. Enemies of the people. Unpublished manuscript, 1966.

85. Wax, M., & Wax, R. Indian education for what? Midcontinent American Studies Journal, 1965, 6, 164-170.

86. Wax, M., Wax, R., & Dumont, R. V., Jr. Formal education in an American Indian community. Cooperative Research Project No. 1361. U. S. Office of Education. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Society for the Study of Social Problems (P. O. Box 190), 1964.

87. Wax, R. Oglala Sioux dropouts and their problems with educators. Mimeographed. The University of Kansas.

88. Wax, R. The warrior dropouts. Transaction, 1967, 4, 40-46.

89. Wax, R., & Thomas, R. K. American Indians and white people. Phylon, 1961, 22, 305-317.

90. White, R. The urbanization of the Lakota Indians. Unpublished master's thesis. St. Louis University, 1959.

91. Witherspoon, Y. T. Measurement of Indian children's achievement in the academic tool subjects. Journal of American Indian Education, 1962, 1, 3.

92. Wolcott, H. F. A Kwakiutl village and school. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.

93. Zakoji, H. Termination and the Klamath Indian education program. Oregon State Department of Education, 1961.

94. Zintz, M. The Indian research study: The adjustment of Indian and non-Indian children in the public elementary schools of New Mexico. Albuquerque: College of Education, University of New Mexico, 1960.

95. Zintz, M. Problems of classroom adjustment of Indian children in public elementary schools in the southwest. Science Education, 1962, 46, 261-269.